



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

MODERN WORDS OF RELIGION

Edited by
CARLYLE SUMMERBELL

1075.7



Harvard College Library

FROM

President Eliot

Modern Words *of* Religion

Edited by
Carlyle Summerbell

**The Christian Publishing Association
Dayton, Ohio**

C1075.9

COLLEGE LIBRARY

C

Pres. Quot.

COPYRIGHT, 1915
THE CHRISTIAN PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION
DAYTON, OHIO

To
THE COMMON SOLDIERS
of
RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

whose names have been forgotten, but whose deeds are continuously used in building the temple for free humanity, to be enjoyed by all generations,
"MODERN WORDS OF RELIGION"

is respectfully and
affectionately
DEDICATED.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introductory—

APOLOGIA. Editor	11
SEARCH. (Poem) James H. West, Tufts College, Massachusetts	14
TRUTH. Rev. J. J. Summerbell, D. D. (Called into the Great Beyond.)	15

Denominational Issues—

THE CHRISTIANS AND CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP. Rev. Frank H. Peters, D. D., President of The New England Christian Convention	25
UNIVERSALISM IN A NUTSHELL. Rev. Stephen Crane, D. D. (Called into the Great Beyond.)....	29
MEMBERSHIP IN A CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH. Rev. Clarence F. Swift, D. D., Pastor of the Central Congregational Church, Fall River, Mass.	33
CHURCH UNITY AND FELLOWSHIP AS RELATED TO UNITARIANS. Rev. Samuel A. Eliot, D. D., President of the American Unitarian Association	39
A REASONABLE FAITH. O. Edward Janney, Chair- man, The General Conference of the Religious Society of Friends	47
THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE CHRISTIANS TO THE KINGDOM OF JESUS CHRIST. Rev. J. F. Burnett, D. D., Secretary of The American Christian Convention, ...	55

Foreign Mission Attitude—

UNITY IN MISSIONS. Rev. M. T. Morrill, D. D., Secretary for Foreign Missions of the Christian Church	65
OUR ATTITUDE TOWARD FOREIGN MISSIONS. Rev. Charles W. Wendte, D. D., Secretary of the Department of Foreign Relations of the American Unitarian Association	73
OUR ATTITUDE TOWARD FOREIGN MISSIONS. Rev. Frederick A. Bisbee, D. D., Editor <i>Universalist Leader</i> , Boston	79
OUR ATTITUDE TOWARD FOREIGN MISSIONS. Rev. J. Pressley Barrett, D. D., Editor <i>Herald of Gospel Liberty</i> , Dayton, Ohio	83

Biblical Literature—

BIBLICAL INTERPRETATION AS RELATED TO PRIVATE JUDGMENT. Rev. Martyn Summerbell, LL. D., President Palmer Institute-Starkey Seminary, Lakemont, N. Y.	97
MODERN BIBLICAL CRITICISM. Rev. Crawford H. Toy, LL. D., Professor in Harvard University....	107
THE BIBLE IN OUR TIME. Rev. John Haynes Holmes, Minister Church of the Messiah, New York City	121

Religious Progress—

THE CHURCH OF THE FUTURE. Rev. J. O. Atkinson, D. D., Editor <i>Christian Sun</i> , Elon College, N. C.	137
A LOOK AHEAD IN SUNDAY-SCHOOL WORK. Rev. William I. Lawrance, D. D., Secretary of the Department of Religious Education of the American Unitarian Association.....	141
FUTURE RELIGION. Charles W. Eliot, LL. D., Presi- dent Emeritus, Harvard University	145

Religion and Modern Life—

MAKING FOR THE WORLD'S BETTERMENT. Rev. Alva M. Kerr, Pastor Christian Church, Pleasant Hill, Ohio	161
THE NEW CHIVALRY. Rev. Wilbur F. Crafts, Ph. D., Superintendent International Reform Bureau, Washington, D. C.	173
THE SPIRIT OF LENT AND LIBERAL CHRISTIANITY. Rev. Joseph F. Newton, Litt. D., Pastor Liberal Christian Church (Universalist), Cedar Rapids, Iowa	181
THE HYMN. Rev. Jenkin Lloyd Jones, LL. D., Editor <i>Unity</i> , Chicago	191
THE RELIGIOUS USES OF THE IMAGINATION. Rev. Willard L. Sperry, Ph. D., Minister Central Congregational Church, Boston	207
THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH AND WAR. Rev. Charles E. Jefferson, D. D., Pastor Broadway Tabernacle Church, New York City	223
COMMENTS ON RELIGION AND MEDICINE. Fenner A. Chace, M. D., Dermatologist Union Hospital, Fall River, Massachusetts	231
THE PECULIAR FUNCTION OF THE FREE CHRISTIAN CHURCHES OF AMERICA. Rev. Frank G. Coffin, D. D., President American Christian Convention	239

INTRODUCTORY

APOLOGIA

JUST why the Congregational and Unitarian churches, the "Christians," the Universalists, the "Friends," should continue to remain in more or less isolation from one another, is a question that presents itself to the coming generation with increased force. History may show how and under what impulses of religious freedom these great beneficent movements arose, and traditions of past glorious achievements are a rich heritage for any man of the present. But the true genius of these advance steps in civilization calls for faithfulness to the nearest duty, and an adjustment to the exigencies of the kingdom of God which to-day are at hand.

The ambitious purpose of "Modern Words of Religion," is to serve as introductory to free churchmen among themselves, so that the next progressive movement may be clearly discerned. Many clergymen, taking only their own denominational publications, besides of course the general literary periodicals, and applying themselves with close concentration to the various calls of their profession, are likely to become somewhat provincial, and judge other denominations from

second-hand information, or from what these churches have been instead of what they are. For clergymen, especially the young men from whom must come the religious leaders of the future, this book has been prepared. While the writers are prominent in their respective denominations they are responsible only for their own writings, not for the book as whole. It is not an exhaustive treatise, and much excellent matter is omitted on account of lack of space, but this volume attempts to be a fairly representative expression of the spirit of the times among the so-called liberal churches.

We confess that "Christians Unite," seems to us a rallying cry that is both opportune and logical. The many failures of our present civilization in the United States and Canada, which Dr. Wilbur F. Crafts hints at in "The New Chivalry," the magnificent opportunities for missions at home and abroad, the coming increased pressure of the Roman Catholic communion, these and many other phenomena of the twentieth century all give an imperative call for a mighty effort. And if the effort can honestly be united in one grand Hallelujah chorus, the music will be far more effective and inspirational to the world than the attempted ditties of various bands of singers in different pitch and time.

The sections of Protestantism are being drawn together slowly but surely by the centripetal

force of truth, and who can better demonstrate the harmony of social interests than free Churchmen, who are listening for the voice of the Almighty on living issues, who fear not to write or revise their individual creeds as new light shines, and who should ever be willing to follow where God leads?

Unity cannot be forced. Rome has tried forced unity and failed. Unity to be permanent must be founded on truth, appreciation, and deep convictions, with a rational and loving religious temper. Unity cannot be voted, or hurried, or sentimentalized into life. It must grow as the flowers, spread its branches forth as the trees, and prosper as God and men work T O G E T H E R .

SEARCH

JAS. H. WEST.

*What thought of God have hungering men to-day
That they themselves have not sought out and
found?*

*What spot of earth is christened holy ground
But where high souls have walked their
human way?*

*What laws and precepts by which sages say
Life's good is best set free and evil bound,
But come from fine endeavors proven sound
By love and agonies of young and gray?*

*All faith, all knowledge, springs in man's own
heart,*

*And from his partial sight he molds his creed,
Not thinking he shall wider know and see!*

Henceforth mankind shall learn this wiser part:—

*Who honors Truth, in thought and word and
deed,*

He best, O mighty Marvel, worships Thee.

TRUTH

THE REV. J. J. SUMMERBELL, D. D.

IN 1 Tim. 3: 15, Paul calls the church a "pillar and ground of the truth."

A superficial look at the church will cause some to regard it as the abode of error. If you select the peculiar tenets of any sect, the majority of other Christians will say that these tenets are false. One denomination teaches immersion, another sprinkling; one the vicarious atonement, and another despises that doctrine; one predestination, and another Arminianism; one the trinity of God, and another the strict unity of God; one a religion spiritual, another a materialistic system; one that immersion in water is essential to salvation, another that Holy Ghost baptism is the only one required since the apostolic age.

If any one sect is true, the rest cannot be. And yet the apostle speaks of the church as a "pillar and ground of the truth." And it is what Paul says; one pillar, one support.

The importance of truth cannot be too much impressed. For well-defined conceptions rule men. He who knows what he believes becomes a leader. The man who does not know is sure to fail. The church that does not know disintegrates. But let a man believe that he has the truth, and that

his truth is important, and he is on the way to accomplish results. The Mohammedan war-cry, "There is one God, and Mohammed is His prophet," contained one most important truth, which, hurled against the shams of the Greek Church, bore them down wherever there was contact. The doctrine of "one God" smote a plurality of gods with crushing force, and also the people that trusted in more than one. The early Christians believed firmly in the resurrection of Christ, and their belief made them heroes; they swept philosophers, priests, orators, and kings before them. In our day the German belief in the unity of the empire caused the emperor to be crowned at Versailles. The firm convictions of the abolitionists in the sinfulness of slavery made compromises a mockery, and defied the best schemes of statesmen to settle the question. And the "fathers" of our own brotherhood had studied the Bible, knew what it taught, and though they might differ in opinion, felt the importance of truth, and the people who listened respected them as sincere men, who had a message; sinners were converted, churches were established, and prosperity attended their labors: they were not looking for the "best churches:" for they could organize churches, every locality being a field of usefulness for them. They believed there was truth; that truth was important; they preached it vehemently, they conquered, God blessed their labors abundantly. Their converts were faithful, their churches became strong.

But, there is truth, and there is truth. Many a man thinks it important to simulate passions and deeds, and he acts them truly. It would be a more important truth if those passions and deeds were actual. It may be a truth that a man may make two cents a yard on the calico he sells over his counter. It is a more important truth if his clerk cannot pay his rent. It may be true that Queen Victoria went to Windsor. It is a more important truth that she depends for salvation on Christ. There is the truth of ancestry; of history; of art; of religion.

Some truth is worth dying for; some truth is too contemptible to hear, or to tell, or to know; and we hardly call it truth.

The great truth concerns—

- I. God.
- II. Jesus Christ, the son of God.
- III. Man, in relation to God and Christ.
- IV. Man, in relation to man.
- V. Science, art, etc.

When we turn to the law of God himself, as given by himself, we find that the first commandment refers to God; the second refers to his image; the third refers to his name; the fourth refers to his day. God thus teaches this doctrine: that true conceptions concerning him are important.

The church that does not care for the truth must become odious to the angels. The prophet condemns such a people, in such language as the following:

Jer. 9: 3, "They are grown strong in the land, but not for the truth."

Isa. 59: 14, "Truth is fallen in the streets."

Hos. 4: 1, "Hear the word of the Lord, ye children of Israel: for the Lord hath a controversy with the inhabitants of the land, because there is no truth, nor mercy, nor knowledge of God in the land."

Rom. 1: 25, "They exchange the truth of God for a lie, and worship and serve the creature rather than the Creator."

There can be no truth as important as that about God. To attack it as not practical truth is absurd. The man who does it is not on the side of God, nor of Christ, nor Isaiah, nor Hosea, nor Jeremiah, nor Paul. They thought the truth about God was worth teaching. Paul and Jesus thought it was worth dying for. Jesus himself was condemned to death because he claimed to be the Son of God, in answer to the adjuration of Caiaphas, the high priest. And he said, in that connection, "To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness to the truth." It was Pilate, who, in ancient times, sneered at truth, saying, "What is truth?" But Jesus felt that he was born, sent into the world, to bear witness to the truth. And the truth to which he so bore witness, was as to his own nature. It is then likely that ministers who have little interest in that kind of truth, have a different spiritual or intellectual trend from that of the Son of God. Jesus was as liberal, and had as much "insight" into the "eternal verities" as some of our modern writers, who deride the subjects in which he was interested.

The Bible encomiums on truth, or exhortations in favor of the truth, are clear. Here are some of them:—

Prov. 3: 3, "Let not mercy and truth forsake thee; bind them about thy neck; write them on the table of thine heart."

Zech. 3: 3, "Jerusalem shall be called the city of truth."

John 4: 23-24, "But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth; for such doth the Father seek to be his worshippers. God is a spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth."

The saying of Christ to the Samaritan woman hardly agrees with the doctrine so often preached now, that it does not make any difference what a man believes. He teaches that we must even worship "in truth." Oh, ye "broadminded" (?), who criticise so humorously the poor benighted men who love the gospel of the Lord in the very terms in which the Lord gave it, bring your battering rams against the doctrine of the Savior; show how narrow he was to say that God sought such to worship him as would worship him in truth; show how we can believe anything or nothing, and get to heaven just as well, as to believe the truth; show how insisting, in preaching, or in writing, on truth, is only dogmatism, that any man who does it is behind the age; rebuke the Lord,—Peter did it once, he "took him and began to rebuke him." Show Jesus how an earnestness on truth chains men, binds them; that we can only be free by admitting that "truth" is an uncertain quantity. Argue (for, with all your liberalism

you are given to argument and strife) that no man can be free, unless he casts off intellectual fetters; and then read the following words of Jesus about freedom:—

John 8: 32, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

I am sure that Jesus understood the subject as well as ye who "rebuke him." Indeed, there is no freedom without truth. Error enthralls; truth emancipates. It is not necessary to reason it out; let us accept the Master's word. He is our leader, and not the men, who wander about, not knowing what they believe, "always learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth." They can never become heroes; Jesus, our leader, is one to follow indeed, the great hero of earth and heaven. Paul says,—

"Stand, therefore, having your loins girt about with truth." (Eph. 6: 14)

We might say that truth is the most valuable thing in the universe, next to freedom. It is so high a possession that Jesus calls himself "the truth." In religion, victories are won with truth. Cast aside the girdle of truth, and every thorn detains the traveling Christian, becoming entangled in his robe flowing too freely; every "wind of doctrine" whirls the garment about his blindfolded eyes. Truth has secured our modern advantages. A supposed truth drew Columbus to the New World. The New World truth is connected with our liberties. The truth of steam makes the engine possible that draws the village

across the continent, or the palace across the ocean. The truth of electricity makes the telegraph a familiar institution, and the telephone a fact. The sewing machine, the reaper, the mower, the phonograph,—what are these but truth crystallized into machinery?

To scorn truth of science, or religion, dogmatic or practical, or any other department of life, is not necessarily a proof of a true mind.

“Buy the truth and sell it not.”

“A large estate that soul hath got,
That buys the truth and sells it not.”

DENOMINATIONAL ISSUES

THE CHRISTIANS AND CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP

THE REV. FRANK H. PETERS, D. D.

President New England Christian Convention

AS a people, the Christians are unique. We have certain principles which to us are absolutely fundamental to the growth and effectiveness of the Church of Jesus Christ. The modern spirit of cordial co-operation among the sects now manifest in the various interdenominational movements seem to us to be the partial fulfillment of a dream which we have held in our minds for more than a hundred years, hoping and praying that, please God, it might come true.

The great fact that underlies this inter-denominational fellowship, viz., that it is not necessary for people to think alike in order to worship together, was advocated by the pioneers of our movement. They erected upon this foundation the only superstructure it could consistently hold,—the twofold right to interpret the Bible for one's self and to receive Christian fellowship on the basis of Christian character. Since human leaders and party names suggest division, they recognized no leader other than Jesus Christ and wished to be called simply Christians.

In this last our people have been persistently misunderstood. Men of other orders have said we have no right to use a name which is the common

right of all the followers of Jesus. But we contend it is the true and all sufficient name for all Christians and we do not mean to use it in any exclusive or arbitrary sense. We cordially invite all denominations to lay aside names that suggest division and join us in being simply Christians.

With such a message on our lips, our attitude toward other Christians naturally would be most cordial, and we would be expected to be leaders in encouraging fellowship and co-operation in Christian work. But our influence in this direction has not been as great as we could wish. The fact that we are a rural people has handicapped us. Our voice has not been effective in the great centers of population, because we have not had men and means sufficient to maintain ourselves in the midst of the multitude. The new spirit and attitude now coming to the front, are known to our people as the familiar things we have believed and cherished for more than a century.

Throughout our history we had many people, some of them prominent in our councils, who have failed to understand the logic of our position, or who have been unwilling to accept it. This has tended to narrow our fellowship and weaken our plea. Such have seemed to think to run our own shop and be willing to open our door if any one should ask admission, is to do our full duty. Some of these men have been unwilling to grant to others the freedom they claimed for themselves. They have contended that the right of individual interpretation—*our great cardinal principle*—applies only to the non-essentials,—a contention

which, if allowed, leaves them to determine what are essentials and what not. This is far enough removed from individual rights to meet the hearty approval of the most confirmed religious bigot. And so unwittingly we have dulled the edge of our own sword, placed obstructions on our own track, and laid ourselves open to the charge of being the slimmest pillar on the broadest base.

But in spite of all this, our intent is to make Christian character our only test of fellowship. To this great principle we wish our voice and our deeds to ring true.

"For modes of faith we are willing to let earnest zealots
fight

Believing his can't be far afield whose life is in the right."

Of course, it is true that this broad spirit is permeating all Christian bodies and bids fair to become the ruling spirit of the Christian world. Whether so or not, it is the Christlike attitude and the only one which His followers can consistently maintain.

The Christians gladly join hearts and hands with all of whatever name or order, who fear God and work righteousness. We are not afraid of the Christian scholar be he scientist or theologian. We put no halo about the heads of dogmas, old or new. Our supreme aim is to know the truth, believing that will make us free.

Christians of every order have equal rights within our fellowship. In some of our churches Baptists and Quakers, Presbyterians and Universalists, dwell together in unity and in the bonds

of peace. And just as soon as the Christian world recognizes the practicability of this in the broadest sense, division walls will tumble and much of the waste of present useless competition will be done away.

Meantime, we of the Christian Connection, by precept and example, will endeavor to exemplify this Christlike attitude toward all His disciples in the hope that we may make some real contribution toward the ultimate triumph of the true spirit and life of Jesus Christ.

“Then let us pray that come it may,
And come it will, for a’ that,
That man to man, the warl’ o’er,
Shall brithers be for a’ that.”

UNIVERSALISM IN A NUTSHELL

THE REV. STEPHEN CRANE, D. D.

THE AGREEMENT

ALL Christians believe in the Bible; Universalists believe in the Bible. All Christians believe in God; Universalists believe in God. All Christians believe in Christ; Universalists believe in Christ. All Christians believe in immortality; Universalists believe in immortality. All Christians believe in the resurrection of the dead; Universalists believe in the resurrection of the dead. All Christians believe in punishment for sin; Universalists believe in punishment for sin. All Christians believe in repentance, regeneration, forgiveness, and salvation; Universalists believe in repentance, regeneration, forgiveness, and salvation. All Christians believe in the importance of the Christian life; Universalists believe in the importance of the Christian life. Therefore Universalists must be Christians. We agree with all Christians on so many points of doctrine, that we, too, must be Christians.

THE DIFFERENCE

The common opinion is that the Bible is a revelation from God. The Universalist doctrine is that

the Bible contains a revelation of God, or is record of a special manifestation of divine truth and love. The common opinion is that God is the creator and preserver of all souls, but the Father of Christians only. The Universalist doctrine is that God is the Father of all souls: "The Father of the spirits of all flesh."

The common opinion is that sin will be punished if not repented of, the Universalist doctrine is that sin is punished that it may be repented of. The common opinion is that the penalty of sin is inflicted after death, the Universalist doctrine is that the infliction of the penalty begins when sin is committed, and continues until the sin is repented of. The common opinion is that punishment is some external castigation beyond the grave, the Universalist doctrine is that punishment is inward and spiritual, the soul's suffering for violating moral law. The common opinion is that sinners repent for fear they will be punished, the Universalist doctrine is that sinners repent because they are punished.

The common opinion is that regeneration is a re-birth, a radical change of nature, the Universalist doctrine is that regeneration is a higher birth, a birth from above, the soul's realization of spiritual things. The common opinion is that men are forgiven the punishment due their sins, the Universalist doctrine is that there is no forgiveness of punishment, that it is the sin and not the punishment that is forgiven.

The common opinion is that salvation is from punishment. The Universalist doctrine is that

salvation is from sin. The common opinion is that punishment is vindictive and therefore endless; the Universalist doctrine is that punishment is reformatory and therefore limited.

The common opinion is that Christ is God, the Universalist doctrine is that Christ is the son of God, "the brightness of the Father's glory and the express image of His person." The common opinion is that the atonement is the reconciliation of God to man, the Universalist doctrine is that the atonement is the reconciliation of man to God.

The common opinion is that Christ will save a part of mankind, the Universalist doctrine is that Christ will save all mankind. The common opinion is that all efforts for the salvation of souls end at death; the Universalist doctrine is that these efforts continue after death and end only when all souls are saved.

The common opinion is that the "day of judgment" comes at the end of the world; the Universalist doctrine is that "now is the judgment of this world," that the judgment day is the continuous present. The common opinion is that the resurrection takes place at the end of the world; the Universalist doctrine is that the resurrection is present and passing, that the dead are raised even as the living die. The common opinion is that the resurrection is the re-animation of the "self-same physical body;" the Universalist doctrine is that the resurrection is the rising of the soul into the spiritual world, a "spiritual body"—"the image of God"—and in "the image of the heavenly," and a partaker of fadeless and ineffable glory. These

are some of the differences between our common orthodoxy and Universalism.

While Universalists therefore may be Christians, evidently they are not orthodox as that word is now understood.

MEMBERSHIP IN A CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH

THE REV. CLARENCE F. SWIFT, D. D.
*Pastor Central Congregational Church,
Fall River, Massachusetts*

EACH Congregational church makes its own conditions. Those of the Central Congregational Church (Fall River, Massachusetts) are as follows,—

FORM OF ADMISSION with CONFESSION AND COVENANT

“What doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?” (Micah 6: 8)

“Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind.” . . . “Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.” (Matthew 22: 37, 39)

“I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God to salvation to every one that believeth.” (Romans 1: 16)

“With the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation.” (Romans 10: 10)

DEARLY BELOVED:—Because you believe it is a part of the duty and privilege of a true Christian life to give public witness to one's faith, you have come to-day to declare that you are a follower of Christ and that you desire to be received into covenant relations with His Church. We rejoice with you in your faith and purpose, and welcome you to our church on the basis of your acceptance of our Confession and Covenant to which we ask you now to give your cordial assent.

CONFESSION OF FAITH

I believe that God is my loving Heavenly Father, and that He has sent His Son, Jesus Christ, to reveal His character and His will, and to redeem humanity from sin.

Believing that I have been led by the Holy Spirit, I accept Jesus Christ as my Savior, my Teacher, my Example.

I accept the Bible as the record of God's revelation of His will.

I declare it to be my purpose, with the help of the Holy Spirit, to be conscientious in regard to prayer and the study of the Bible, and to make the teachings of the Bible, especially as revealed in the life and words of Jesus Christ, the final standard for my faith; for my conduct in all business and social relations; and in my personal life.

Do you accept this statement as expressing your present faith and purpose?

Response: I do.

BAPTISM

You who now, for the first time, enter into covenant with the Church of Christ, do receive baptism, as the token of the new life wrought in you by the Holy Spirit, and as the sign of your purpose to be forever the Lord's.

(The candidate kneeling, baptism is here administered with the words:)

I baptize thee into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.

(To those who were baptized in childhood the pastor will say:)

You who were baptized in childhood do accept for yourselves, as your own free act, the seal of baptism, to which faith and love brought you.

Response: We do.

(The pastor greets those who bring letters from other churches with these words:)

Beloved in the Lord, who come to renew your vows, and the declaration of faith in Christ, which you have made elsewhere, we bid you welcome. We greet you as kinsmen in Him, and fellow-laborers in His service, and fellow-travelers to His promised rest.

We ask you all to assent to the following

COVENANT

I declare it to be my purpose to be loyal to the interests of the Central Congregational Church as long as I am a member of it. I promise that—

to the extent of my ability—I will conscientiously co-operate in sustaining its worship and its ordinances by my attendance and fellowship; in upholding its good name by a careful Christian life; and in forwarding its work by my sympathy and financial support.

Do you enter cordially into this covenant?

Response: I do.

(The Church rises and repeats:)

We, the members of the Central Congregational Church do most affectionately receive you into our communion, and renew, with you, our covenant. We break with you the bread, and drink with you the cup, at the table of the Lord, in token of our recognition of your membership with us in this household of faith. We give you welcome to all the duties, and all the privileges of this house of God. We pledge to you that same loyalty and fellowship and helpfulness which you have promised to us.

The pastor here extends the right hand of fellowship, after which all repeat together:

“For this cause we bow our knees unto the Father, from whom every family in heaven and on earth is named, that He would grant you, according to the riches of His glory, that ye may be strengthened with power through His Spirit in the inward man; that Christ may dwell in your hearts through faith; to the end that ye, being rooted and grounded in love, may be strong to apprehend with all the saints, what is the breadth and length

and height and depth, and to know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge, that ye may be filled with all the fulness of God.

"Now unto Him that is able to do exceedingly abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us, unto Him be the glory in the Church and in Christ Jesus unto all generations for ever and ever. Amen."
(Ephesians 3:14-21)

Now my own tendency is to simplicity, and I would gladly stand for a simple avowal of discipleship to Jesus Christ as Lord and Master. To me the "Saviorhood," as a practical matter, follows logically from the following and obeying.

I am not quite sure that I represent the attitude of the denomination, however. W. E. Barton, in his "Handbook," says:

"The covenant should be brief and simple, and have embodied in it a brief confession of faith in Christ, an assent to the substance of the doctrine expressed in the articles of faith of the church, and the promise to submit to the government and discipline of the church, etc."

My opinion is that the tendency among our churches is toward simplicity, and that in case of possible uniting with another body, the avowal of discipleship would be considered sufficient.

CHURCH UNITY AND FELLOWSHIP IN RELATION TO UNITARIANS

THE REV. SAMUEL A. ELIOT, D. D.

President American Unitarian Association

THE problem of church unity is, in my judgment, primarily a problem of the simplification of thought and practice. It is the discovery of the relative importance of things. It is a power of discrimination which will enable us to disregard the fallible opinions that divide us and emphasize the deep faiths of the heart that unite us.

All growing life tends to increasing complications. Just as the tree that is now only a budding stalk soon grows into the entanglement of multitudinous leaves and branches, so all forms of human activity—social, intellectual, religious, tend ever toward complexity. In our social habits we look back and speak naturally and legitimately of the primitive habits of our forefathers and contrast them with the multiplying details of our life to-day, with the luxuries that have become our necessities. Our intellectual relationships become increasingly complex. Only two or three generations ago it was possible for a learned man to know practically all there was to be known in the world, while now, the wisest of us can, as it were, but touch the hem of the garment of a single department of the great realm of human knowl-

edge. Religion tends thus to complexity. In all the great religious systems of the world you can trace the development from the primary teaching of a founder into more and more elaborate interpretations of that teaching. Gradually creeds are written, ceremonials introduced, priesthoods established, hierarchies enthroned.

SIMPLIFICATION MEANS REAL PROGRESS

As I read history I cannot but be brought to the conviction that the great leaders of the world's advance have been simplifiers. They have been the men who have called the attention of humanity back from the superadded details to the reconsideration of the primary principles. Many people there are who misunderstand the real nature of religious progress. They apply to it the analogies of our material getting and saving. They make it a process of addition, accumulation, and combination. They use for the church the common figure of the church whose foundations lie four-square and to which each generation is expected to add something, a new tower, or buttress, or outwork. That seems to me to mistake the whole nature of progress.

Religion grows in quite the other way. It is not a process of acquisition, but of simplification. Your spiritual vitality and mine do not depend upon how many things we believe but on how much we believe in anything. Intensity, not multiplicity, of faith is the essential thing. The simplest expressions contain the deepest truths. Our course is most onward when it is most inward.

Our religion grows efficient not when details of doctrine and ritual are multiplied, but as we are inspired by a few great moral and spiritual imperatives. Incoherence and instability attend any church or any man that has no commanding ends, no single-minded purpose. Unity requires first of all that we should be delivered from the dividing intricacies of dogma into what the apostle called "the simplicity that is toward Christ."

SPIRITUAL GROWTH PROMOTES UNITY

And, second, unity appears to me not a question of opinion, but a question of spiritual power. It is not a matter of intellectual consent; it is a matter of spiritual ascent. Controversy thrives on the lower level of Christian living. Our divisions are often the result of mutual ignorance. Dr. Peabody used an excellent figure when he spoke of the religious life as resembling the climbing of a mountain from different sides. Below in the underbrush there is obstruction and limitation and separation. No one can see very far, and his neighbors are not known to him. But as each one climbs up out of the underbrush his vision widens and gradually the paths converge. And when at last each approaches the top, he gets nearer to his neighbors: and when all reach the top they stand together, and there is only one view and that is the view all around.

DIVERSITIES NEED NOT PRECLUDE UNITY

In the third place I venture to affirm that unity is not to be confused with uniformity. It is not a

matter of concession or of compromise, but of conviction. It seems to me the most hopeless condition of religion would be the condition of self-satisfied agreement. Men cannot think at all without dissent, but surely we ought to be able to think seriously and differ widely without prejudice and without mutual distrust. A church unity which means, on the one hand, simply a unity of indifference or aimless good nature, or on the other hand, which means identity of belief or practice, seems to me equally undesirable. All society is made up of co-operating diversities, and the more perfect the society the more widely those who compose it will differ in their habits and tastes and accomplishments. Limit us to men of the same thought and we become simply self-perpetuating sectaries, but give us access to men of other minds and we become partakers of the inexhaustible riches of the divine nature.

I am ready at all times for a good intellectual contest, but I affirm the wisdom of Phillips Brooks when he said, "Tolerance is the result of a conviction, and not of the absence of conviction." It is not shallowness, it is the depth of belief that makes the hospitable and charitable mind. If we can learn to hold our different forms of faith largely enough and vitally enough, then we shall find that they are not walls to separate us one from another, but are avenues through which we can approach one another in sympathy and neighborliness.

These are the principles of unity in diversity that have been worked out in the experience of

the free churches that I represent, a band of churches that find the justification of their being not in any wilfulness, not in any passion for dissent, not in any pride in nonconformity, but in certain deep spiritual principles. The Unitarian churches are the perfectly natural product of the soil of New England, and they represent the logical development of the Puritan principle.

UNITARIANISM

The word has come to mean to—and imply to most people a certain conception and definition of the Godhead, but it signifies merely the “unity men,” the “union men,”—those who affirm not only the unity of God’s being but also all the other great affirmations of unity—the unity of law, one power working impartially and unceasingly, through many manifestations but without favoritism or caprice: the unity of truth, whether revealed in nature or in science or in history or in Scripture or in good lives or in our own souls: the unity of humanity, the verification of the saying that none of us liveth to himself and no man dieth to himself, but that we are all children of one family; the unity of religion, religion always one and the same, though theologies are many; the unity of the spirit, the fraternity that grows out of moral and spiritual sympathies, out of trust toward God and brotherly love toward man.

THE POETIC EXPRESSION OF UNITARIANISM

The representative expressions of the Unitarian habit of mind are not to be sought in the fields of

theological scholarship or Biblical learning, but in a lyric utterance of singular significance. "It is not an accident," said one of the best interpreters of Unitarianism, "that out of a religious movement which is supposed to be a movement of sheer rationalism and dissent there has grown up the most clearly defined type of religious poetry which our country has produced. It is not an accident that the lyrics of Longfellow and Lowell and Holmes and Bryant and Emerson proceed from lives bred in the rational piety of the Unitarians. And when we pass from the great masters it is no surprise that from a group of minor poets of the same tradition—Samuel Longfellow and Samuel Johnson and Hedge and Hosmer and Gannett and Chadwick—there has proceeded a strain of lyric theism whose music penetrates many a church, the doors of which are closed against the poets. That means that beneath the vigorous rationalism or the sincere dissents of the descendants of the Puritans there is this deep movement of religious life, a consciousness of God that only a poet can express, a spiritual lineage that unites this little fellowship of free people to the whole great company of the witnesses of the real presence of God.

You ask me what the Unitarians would and would not sacrifice for the sake of larger unity. Unitarians would not forego the right of private judgment; or the right of testing religious vitality by its fruit, by character and public spirit, or the right to be the unfettered servants of freedom and fraternity. For these causes, they must, if necessary, remain a dissenting minority. But if any

self-complacency obscures their appreciation of their neighbor's merits, if any sectarian pride limits their fellowship, if any spirit of censoriousness diverts them from their major purposes, these must be renounced.

INTELLIGENT CO-OPERATION THE IMMEDIATE NEED

Unity is to be achieved not in yielding to the force of any law of outward constraint, but in willing obedience to the law of liberty. We need in our Christianity a due admixture of conservatism and radicalism, of idealism and formalism. We need to recognize that wisdom is justified of all her children. A true church unity to my mind should aim not at union by crushing independencies, as too often the Roman Church has done, or will it aim at independency by foregoing the benefits of union, as the Protestant Church too often has done. It will combine freedom of thought and form with unity of spirit and co-operation in good works.

My plea is not for a merely amiable sentiment toward our fellow workers of other names and traditions, but for intelligent co-operation under the rational conviction that all are parts of one great religious force. The army cannot spare any of its regiments, but each regiment must be loyal to the whole and do its part in unselfish fidelity.

A GROWING APPRECIATION OF COMMON BELIEFS

Are we not all of us weary of shallow partisanship? Do we not all appreciate how much good there is in schools of thought that are

alien to our own? Men do not contend about the beatitudes or about the Golden Rule. They do not found any sectarianism on the Lord's Prayer. These are the things which so far from dividing us make us ashamed of our divisions. Shall we not agree to live more in the deep, central, vital matters and emphasize the truths that all good men hold in common?

The dogmatic or sacerdotal ideas of Christianity have so long held sway that they will die hard and you and I are not going to see their fall. But already here and there on the citadels of dogmatism we see the white flags of truce. Already it is true of the man who shuts himself up in the close communion of a single sect that he is the real schismatic, and his is the real isolation. However large or strong his special sect, he has cut himself off from the great marching host of Christ—the host of those who are bound together, not by intellectual agreements and not by outward organization, but by spiritual kinship and by the attractions of common ideals.

The birthright Church of all true Christian men more and more attests its true authority. It is founded on the rock of man's spiritual nature. Its fellowship is the fellowship of high ideals and of reasonable service. Its common life is the irrepressible tendency of humanity to reverence and fraternal goodness. Its common faith is in the confidence that "underneath are the everlasting arms," and the assurance that "the things that are seen are temporal, while the things that are not seen are eternal."

A REASONABLE FAITH

O. EDWARD JANNEY

*Chairman The General Conference of the
Religious Society of Friends*

THE Religious Society of Friends has no written creed, and therefore no member is authorized to state its beliefs in a sense that makes the Society responsible. The only statement to be found in the Book of Discipline of Baltimore Yearly Meeting of Friends that directly refers to belief is as follows:

It is the belief of the Religious Society of Friends that God manifested Himself in Jesus Christ, and that the Spirit that was in Jesus is revealed in the human soul and constitutes the Rock on which the Church is founded.

That there is need to-day for a re-statement of Christian faith few open-minded people will deny. The "I believe" of the early days of Christianity, or even of twenty years ago, does not express the religious thought of the present moment.

THE SUPREME BEING

The scientist recognizes the existence of "an energy from which all things are derived," and acknowledges that a transcending Intelligence created the universe. He recognizes no personality in deity. To him God "appears as incessant workman, as universal servant, as tireless, omniscient energizer." (C. W. Eliot.)

But Jesus said, "God is love." From whence came love and joy and peace and tenderness and sympathy and kindness and sacrifice and the desire to serve, if not from God? But those qualities must have been derived from a divine source and are therefore qualities of God. They are personal qualities, and therefore God is personal. He is not only the Creator, not only "the First Great Cause," not only "the power not ourselves that makes for righteousness," He is OUR FATHER.

CHRIST

Probably the most valuable lesson that we derive from a study of the life of Jesus is that it is possible for a man to live a blameless life when obedient to God. Henceforth no one could truly say, "It is impossible for a man to be virtuous," because such a life has been lived. And the same spirit that enabled Jesus to resist temptation is the possession of every human being, for there is a Light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world. If the divinity that was in Jesus become too much exalted and he become in thought more God than man, he at once ceases to be an example to common men, and the most helpful lesson of his life is thus lost to the world which is suffering for this very thing.

If, on the other hand we regard him with Whittier as "the highest possible manifestation of God in man," we can then look upon him as our Brother, with far greater capacity for God than

ourselves, but still our Brother and our great Example.

That Jesus depended wholly upon the indwelling of God is shown by his words and actions. His powerful preaching, his calling upon God in prayer, his wonderful miracles, his patient endurance of insult and suffering, are to be attributed to the Spirit of the Lord which dwelt in him, for he said, "The Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works. I can of myself do nothing; as I hear I judge, and my judgment is just, because I seek not mine own will but the will of the Father, which hath sent me." Could anything be more convincing than this evidence from the lips of the Master? Could any other view of his character and mission be more reasonable?

THE ONE TRUE GOD

It is quite possible that the idea of the Trinity was an inheritance of those who believed in the existence of many gods, and that the belief in monotheism could not be fully comprehended by the minds of many primitive Christians who therefore sought to reconcile the two ideas in the doctrine of three gods in one. Since this is a conception impossible to the reason, men came to accept the thought of God the Father, Jesus as the Son, and the Holy Spirit as a vague divine Person. Many religious persons have thus come to worship two gods and some of them three. To meet the polytheistic demands of a crude form of faith, the Roman Catholic Church has added the Virgin

Mary to the list of those to be worshiped and also her mother, St. Ann, and has not stopped there but added a vast number of saints that daily receive the homage of untold multitudes.

From these polytheistic theories it is a relief to turn to the idea of the One True God that runs through the Bible from Genesis to Revelation. Let us stand firm in the faith of Jesus Christ as stated by himself, "Thou shalt worship THE LORD THY GOD and him only shalt thou serve." Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, *not any other*. We are on sure ground here, for to worship the One True God is religion, the other is theology. It is reasonable to take a stand here; we "can no other."

THE CHURCH

The Church of God is not made up of the members of any sect, but is composed of the righteous wherever found. "In every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him." There are doubtless men and women in benighted countries who are living in accordance with the light they possess. This may be dim indeed, and the best missionary service is to make the light brighter by carrying to them a knowledge of the Light of Christ, the indwelling power of God. There are also many near at hand that need the light quite as much as those more distant, and it is part of the duty of the Church to meet this need.

One important duty of the Church is to assist divine inspiration, to produce the conditions under

which the voice of God may be most easily and clearly heard in the soul, and it would seem that the quiet gathering of a religious assembly in reverent, prayerful silence would be a means to that end. "The Lord is in his holy temple; let all the earth keep silence before him."

If in this atmosphere there is impressed upon the mind of any one present a message that would be helpful to others, or an expression of praise or thanksgiving, accompanied by a distinct feeling that it should be delivered, then such a message, be it prayer or sermon, would form an appropriate part of worship. The ideal religious service would seem to be not that in which one man speaks for all and dominates the gathering, but where each soul seeks access to the Father, assisted it may be, and uplifted by the expression of the inspired thoughts of others.

THE SAVING POWER

The constant and immediate need of every soul is salvation. It needs to be saved from the commission of sin, and from the consequences of wrongdoing. Happily we are not placed in this world without such a provision. Every person is endowed with an indwelling divinity, the "Christ within, the hope of glory."

The influence that saves us from committing sin is the power of God possessed by every healthy minded person, and was clearly shown in the person of Jesus. This same power draws the sinner back to God, forgives him and restores him to communion with the Father. That Jesus

believed this is clearly demonstrated in His parable of the Prodigal Son.

The Master said that God is love, and surely the way to salvation is through obedience. In the sense that Jesus came to show the world the way of salvation, he may be called the Savior; but the Savior thus acknowledged and called to the attention of the people is the indwelling power of God.

THE BIBLE

The real purpose of the Bible is to teach righteousness, not dogma, and it does this, for the most part, through the fascinating method of biography. The Bible depicts by a few broad strokes, the lives of many noble characters, their words and actions, going into fuller detail in the portrayal of the life and teachings of the Master.

The Bible is often called the Word of God, but this term would seem to mean something very different, for "in the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." It would be more correct to speak of the Bible as the words of God and inspired by Him, but as has been said, "The inspiration has come through a human pipe and necessarily must taste of the pipe." To speak of the Bible, as some do, as "the only infallible rule of faith and practice," is far beside the mark, for it attributes to the Bible the power to serve as a spiritual guide on each and every occasion in life, which power belongs alone to the indwelling Spirit of God. On this point Charles Stelze says that modern ideas of religion "do not demand an absolute acceptance of the

inspiration of the Bible, in the narrow sense that some men insist upon. It asks principally that the man who wishes to become a Christian shall bring his life into conformity with the life and purpose of Christ."

Those who have followed the thread of thought will realize that the usually accepted ordinances, such as baptism, do not necessarily enter into the real life of one who is led by the Spirit of God. He possesses the things of which they are but symbols. He who is baptized and purified by the Spirit as by fire needs not the sprinkling of drops of water.

So let us go through life with our Great Companion, comforted in times of sorrow, uplifted from despair, guided in each act of daily life, blest with the consciousness of being a child of our Father, and filled with peace in the thought that we possess the Pearl of Great Price, the spirit of the living God.

THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE CHRISTIANS TO THE KINGDOM OF JESUS CHRIST

THE REV. J. F. BURNETT, D. D.

Secretary American Christian Convention

ABOUT one hundred and twenty-three years ago (1792) the Christians were separated unto themselves for conscience sake. History is a competent critic and a stern judge, and to it we submit ourselves for judgment, and promise to abide the decision.

TO THE KINGDOM OF JESUS CHRIST, THE CHRISTIANS HAVE CONTRIBUTED A MOVEMENT

A movement is more and better than an organization. The organization is to the movement what the body is to the life—a mere vehicle, a convenience.

In the beginning of their movement they found the Bible dominated by creeds and human leaders substituted for Christ. Many churches there were, each and all standing for some particular doctrine, and wearing a purely human name, but not one among them all known simply as Christian. The orthodoxy of the day exalted creed above the Bible, and called upon all men to accept its teaching. The Christians scorned all creeds and thus startled the world, and the startled world cried out heresy, and heresy passed judgment and they were condemned—but not of God. The Bible soon arose

above creed, and Christ above men. One event after another, following in quick succession, proved the faith of the leaders and revealed the fulfillment of the dream of their lives.

From then until now that movement has gone steadily forward, and the time approaches when it shall culminate in the purpose for which it was born—the oneness of all believers in Jesus Christ.

TO THE KINGDOM OF JESUS CHRIST, THE CHRISTIANS
HAVE CONTRIBUTED A GENUINE CHRISTIAN
TOLERANCE

Liberty of conscience, which had been so real to the leaders, was contributed by them in the first great event of their history—when they separated themselves for the sake of truth and the liberty to enjoy it. While they most earnestly contended for the faith once delivered unto the saints, they were then, and are now tolerant of the conception and interpretation of their fellow men. They have kept themselves open to conviction; they have taken the good they found, no matter where, and woven it into their fabric; they have kept their minds wide open for truth and while holding most tenaciously to the fundamentals, they have tolerated the widest range of investigation and accepted the various conclusions of men as their rightful personal possessions, and thus while including the greatest possible variety of faith and the widest range of interpretation, they have dwelt together in the unity of the spirit and the bond of peace.

In the days of Galileo, the Papal Council required him to get down upon his knees and say, "I adjure, curse, and detest the heresy of the motion of the earth and I promise to teach that the earth is the center of the universe and an immovable body." But arising, he muttered between his teeth, "Nevertheless, it does move."

In the Continental Congress, the Hon. John Jay opposed opening the session with prayer, because there were Quakers and Presbyterians and Anabaptists on the floor and the representatives of the sects might not listen to the prayer of one not of their particular sect. That spirit of intolerance was yet in the world when the Christians were born, but is now no more.

No ecclesiastical court, no dogmatical tribunal, has ever been established among them, for those whose creed is the Bible only, and whose fellowship is extended to all believers in Jesus Christ could not sit in judgment upon men's conscience. Nothing, absolutely nothing except Christian character itself is of greater value to the Christian world than this. Better a thousand times that they should lose their material possessions, their schools, and their organizations, than to lose that spirit of Christian tolerance that has been prominent and effective through all their years.

Other religious bodies have as many and as good ministers as they, as much and more money, as many and greater enterprises, but none of them all combine such stern Christian character, deep spirituality, fervent faith, and a fundamental

anchorage with such tolerance as do the Christians.

TO THE KINGDOM OF JESUS CHRIST, THE CHRISTIANS
HAVE CONTRIBUTED A REMARKABLE MINISTRY

Their first ministers were popular preachers in the leading denominations of the country; they were happily and hopefully associated; many of them were well educated. Purviance was a teacher of Latin and Greek; Stone, a teacher of language and had studied Hebrew under a Prussian doctor; and these were followed by such men as Craig, Summerbell, Wellons, and others whose educational qualification has never been questioned. But from the first until now, aside from the appeal of sacrifice and service, there has been no appeal to men to enter the ministry of the Christians. Unless one was willing to work hard, live saving, and die poor, one had no appeal to enter their ministry. The early ministers were without pulpit, without home, and without salary, and yet they never faltered and they never hesitated, but, like their Master, they forsook the opulent Church, denied themselves the possibility of comfort and popularity, and went forth calling upon men to repent and believe the gospel. What was true of the ministers in the beginning has been true all the way along. The ministers of the Christians must forego the popular place; they must be content to work in obscure places; they must deny themselves the luxury and ease of the wealthy congregation, and go out alone and preach to the poor. They have willingly and gladly responded to this

appeal; they have made themselves of no reputation, but have really taken the form of a servant and ministered to the needy.

They have labored without money and without price and have made a contribution of loving service to the kingdom of Jesus Christ equal to any class of contributors the world has ever known.

TO THE KINGDOM OF JESUS CHRIST, THE CHRISTIANS
HAVE CONTRIBUTED UNDYING AND
IRREDUCIBLE PRINCIPLES

The principles:

The Bible, a sufficient rule for faith and practice,
Jesus Christ, the only Head of the Church,
Christian character, a sufficient test of fellowship,
Private interpretation, the right and duty of all,
The name Christian, a sufficient name for believers,

are eternal, fundamental, imperishable, and irreducible. They were not originated by the Christians, neither were they appropriated by them. They are the laws of the kingdom and the common heritage of the family.

The Christians simply declined to appropriate any additional names and refused to be governed by any other laws, and thus they contributed to the kingdom of Jesus Christ, that which is its very own.

They would that all believers would accept their creed alone, acknowledge their Leader alone, submit to their test of fellowship alone, grant all men the right they enjoy, and wear alone the name of their common Lord, and when that glad, good day shall come and the redeemed of the Lord shall sing

together the coronation song, there shall be no human creeds, no human leader, no human name, no human test of fellowship, no limitations of the rights of the soul. Why should there be any now?

TO THE KINGDOM OF JESUS CHRIST, THE CHRISTIANS
HAVE CONTRIBUTED OTHER VALUABLE
AND IMPORTANT THINGS

They have been the leaders in Christian union, in religious journalism, in recognizing the equality of the sexes, in ordaining women to the ministry, in co-education, in discarding human creeds, in refusing human names, in establishing a spiritual brotherhood that extends its fellowship to all believers, in restoring open communion, in recognizing the divine right of man, and many other wholly blessed and helpful things, which the Christian world has been slow to recognize, but which some day will shine forth with a radiance that shall pale into eternal forgetfulness the human, the traditional, and the sectarian spirit of the ages.

There was a time in my life when I hoped and expected the Christians to become the largest denomination of the world, but in the thirty-eight years of my ministry, I have not seen a great increase in our denominational strength, but I have seen these great principles taken up and I have heard them proclaimed by many other ministers and churches. I have never preached to large congregations, I have never received a large salary, and certainly no great honor has ever come to me, but to know that the principles I love, and

have tried to proclaim, have been taken up by progressive pulpits, taught in great schools, and believed by thousands outside our membership is compensation enough for my service and honor enough for my life.

FOREIGN MISSION ATTITUDE

UNITY IN MISSIONS

THE REV. M. T. MORRILL, D. D.

*Secretary for Foreign Missions of the Christian
Church*

ONE prominent feature of foreign missionary work, and a most valuable result of it, is unity—such unity as has afforded example and inspiration for the churches in America and other countries. It is likely that the most practical lessons in essentials—what to keep and what to let go—were first taught and learned in the give and take of missionary life.

One can easily discover why missionaries, then missions, then native churches, co-operated, federated, and eventually came into unity. They quickly found that no church or denomination can ever evangelize the thousand million people that need evangelization: the task is too great. They found that the impact of a united church on non-Christian society is absolutely essential for real missionary success. A united front opposed to entrenched sin or evil social custom is vastly more effective than scattered protest. Again, it was found that oriental peoples have no interest in the schisms, disputed dogmas, or historic differences of occidental churches; they fail to understand denominational distinctions. The result has been to teach us all that some things we have tenaciously held as essentials were not such. And then

it was found also that harmony and unity conduce directly to deep vital piety and effective evangelism. More recently it has become evident that the closest affiliation is necessary in education and philanthropy if institutions at all adequate are to be built up.

For years comity has been practiced in many missionary fields and lands. Overlapping and competition have appeared sinful waste, and hence fields have been parcelled out among missionary agencies, and boundaries have been strictly regarded. Even in cities the rule has been operative, and although many denominations have missions in (let us say) Tokyo, Japan, the city is so large, and the missionaries so scattered that overlapping is avoided.

But the swing toward unity has gone far beyond maintenance of comity. The various missions have become friendly one to another, have helped one another, have come into harmonious relations; and the official acts of one mission are regarded by others. There is no bidding for constituency.

Some readers of this will probably remember that when missionaries entered the Philippines, most of them did so to plant an evangelical Christian church without denominational names. There is practically one church and one name known in Korea. The tendency is in the same direction in India, China, and Japan. We may some day speak of the "Japanese Christian Church."

Definite forms of co-operation and federation and union now exist in most mission fields. Bodies of similar names and polities have united, several

kinds of Methodists into one church, and so with Baptists and Presbyterians, and others, examples being found in Japan, China, India, Korea, and elsewhere. We all have in mind the formation, in recent years, of just one Methodist church in Japan.

Furthermore, dissimilar bodies have federated for actual service. The China Centenary Missionary Conference adopted plans for the "Christian Federation of China," to encourage the "sentiment and practice of unity." In that Conference, in 1907, a speaker said: "The native church practically knows but one organization." For years there has been an organization known as "The Federated Missions of Japan," and that suggested a Federation of Churches that now includes eighty per cent. of Japanese Christians. In Korea and Formosa missions have swapped fields for the sake of unifying the work; and only recently representatives of the boards and societies operating in Mexico met and parcelled out the territory anew so as to avoid overlapping and to unify fields. This shows how closely together the various agencies have come. In Korea they have a union hymn-book; a common name for the church; a Federal Council of Evangelical Missions; an Educational Federation; several union schools, and other co-operative forms of work. In India, at the Madras Conference, a missionary court was created for adjustment of differences arising among Christians. In all countries blessed by any of these federations committees have been

appointed for common service and promotion of further unity.

China has for years afforded a practical exhibition of close affiliation of denominations in educational work, for example, in Shantung, Nanking, Tungchou, and Peking. A great Christian university is already in process of building, supported by Methodists, Presbyterians, and Disciples of Christ. Funds are being gathered from all communions for a similar university in Japan. Here is a task too great for one denomination or body, because ultimately millions of dollars must be put into universities that will rank with the institutions subsidized with government millions.

Very strong pronouncements on union and unity have from time to time been made by missionary gatherings in missionary lands. The China Centenary Conference, in 1907, said: "We frankly recognize that we differ as to methods of administration and church government, but we unite in holding that these differences do not invalidate an assertion of our real unity in our common witness to the gospel of the Christ of God; that in planting the Church of Christ on Chinese soil we desire only to plant one Church under the sole control of Jesus Christ, governed by the word of the living God, and lighted by His guiding spirit." In 1900, at Tokyo, a similar conference declared: "This conference of missionaries, assembled in the city of Tokyo, proclaims its belief that all those who are one with Christ are one body, and it calls upon all those who love the Lord Jesus and His Church in sincerity and in truth to pray and to labor for

the full realization of such a corporate oneness as the Master Himself prayed for on that night in which He was betrayed." In the Continuation Committee Conference in China in 1913 steps toward unity were urged on the churches, and one name, "The Christian Church in China," was recommended. At the Conference in Japan the Japanese leaders said: "It is the sincere hope and earnest prayer of every Christian man and woman that all the churches representing Christianity in Japan may come together and be made one in Christ, with one faith, one order, and one work; but we think it will be sometime before this high ideal can be realized."

All this has had its effect on the Church in America, and doubtless has helped forward with a mighty impetus the spirit of unity among denominations. The foreign mission boards and societies of the denominations have been strong leaders in the right direction. For more than twenty years many of the missionary agencies of Canada and the United States have maintained the "Foreign Missions Conference of North America," gradually drawing closer together, fostering unity, and creating committees exerting international influence. This Conference has been practically adopted as the foreign missions commission of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. In January, 1914, at New York, members of the Foreign Missions Conference met for two days to consider how to promote unity in foreign mission lands. The spirit and utterances of that meeting were quite remarkable.

Home mission agencies are federated as the "Home Missions Council," to secure systematic oversight of home fields, practice comity, and bring to bear a common force for furtherance of evangelical work in home mission territory. This Council occupies a position in the Federal Council similar to that held by the Foreign Missions Conference.

The woman's boards, home and foreign, have their federations also, and to them belongs the honor of pioneering this method of co-operation and introduction of unity.

Within a few years the Laymen's Missionary Movement has sprung into existence and brought still closer to one another the many denominations in America. This Movement has persistently devoted itself to foreign missions in its great conventions and continent-wide campaigns. Probably without exception the greatest success has been achieved where the largest number of denominations co-operated. Especially is this true in the every-member canvass for missionary funds. Where all the churches of a city unite in the simultaneous canvass, the missionary spirit runs high. Hence the Movement preaches inclusive and very close fellowship.

At the Men's National Missionary Congress, held in Chicago in 1910 as a fitting close to the Laymen's Missionary Movement campaign, the spirit of unity characterized all the sessions, and unity was a theme for discussion. Dr. Robert E. Speer delivered the most telling address on the theme the writer of this has ever heard, drawing

his facts and illustrations from foreign missions. Here are some of his sentiments: "In the second place, the elementary needs of non-Christian peoples call alone for what is primary and essential in Christianity. . . . And these three things, the character of God and the love of God and the life of God, are not the things about which we disagree. All Christians unite in these great convictions, and these are the very things for which the primary and elementary needs of the non-Christian peoples essentially call." "The ideal of the missionary enterprise is not to perpetuate in all lands the divisions which now keep us apart here, but to locate in every separate national and racial character the great principles of the gospel, that they may be naturalized and find their own indigenous home in that national and racial life." "These considerations demand not only a negative abstention from all waste and friction, but a positive and brotherly co-operation." "In the third place, I believe they call for a real spiritual, corporate unity. . . . First of all, because that is the kind of unity for which our Lord prayed." "Gentlemen, I call you to remembrance that what our Lord prayed for was not fraternal relations. . . . It was the ideal of a oneness as vital, as real, as the unity which binds the Godhead itself. And what our Lord held up as His ideal is the ideal which we should cherish also as ours."

And now we are in a United Missionary Campaign, embracing both home and foreign missionary agencies, and many denominations. Experience will show whether this form of campaigning

is wisest, but it seems as if a general awakening of all benevolent societies in the Church would result most favorably for each.

Our subject is far from being exhausted, but sufficient has been written to show what a mighty unifying influence the foreign mission enterprise has exerted on the Church at home and abroad. It is altogether likely that the first real union of the church will show itself in a foreign mission land.

OUR ATTITUDE TOWARD FOREIGN MISSIONS

THE REV. CHARLES W. WENDTE, D. D.

*Secretary of the Department of Foreign Relations
of the American Unitarian Association*

WHETHER we shall remain a small sect, a merely local worship, or, stirred by a nobler vision, aspire to become a leader and guide of humanity in its pursuit of truth, religious assurance and universal brotherhood, should be for us a dominant question of our personal and denominational life. Upon its right solution depends ultimately our continued existence as a religious fellowship, for the Church that does not give itself, heart and soul and treasure, to the extension of its convictions and principles must deteriorate and die. Of churches as well as of nations it is written, "Where there is no vision the people perish."

To increase the urgency of this appeal to our larger sympathy and endeavor there is added a consideration which impresses itself upon every one at all familiar with the existing conditions of religious thought and life in every nation that has awakened to any serious search for spiritual life and liberty. *Only a rational and progressive form of Christianity can meet the needs of the awakening world.*

As liberal Christians we claim that we are reasonably free from irrational creeds and artificiality of worship; that the form of Christian faith we cherish, if properly presented, would be found best fitted for the spiritual and ethical needs of those who in non-Christian lands seek for light, liberty, and life. How great, then, is our opportunity, how great our responsibility to our brethren in the bondage of error, or struggling for freedom, assurance, and spiritual peace!

We must sadly admit that as a religious fellowship we are not as conscious of this obligation as we ought to be. Our contribution to the world's burden of missionary service is inappreciable, and much below what our intellectual and material resources would permit.

The motive of Unitarian Christianity is the same as that of orthodoxy,—the spirit of altruism, displayed in a disinterested extension of liberal Christian beliefs and humanitarian service.

The dogmatic conception of Christianity, inspired by fear and based on the authority of stereotyped creeds and infallible Scriptures, has hitherto prevented Unitarian and other liberal Christians from co-operating in foreign missionary work. But this abstention is no longer to be justified. There is room, abroad as well as at home, for that gospel of reason, love, and progress which has been so well synthesized in the popular statement of our Faith by James Freeman Clarke:—

1. We believe in the Fatherhood of God.
2. The Brotherhood of Man.

3. The Leadership of Jesus.
4. Salvation by Character.
5. The Progress of Mankind, onward and upward forever.

These five points of Unitarian Christianity we would substitute for the five points of Calvinism, and make them our message to the world. We believe that the unbounded stores of truth, love, hope, and joy they contain will cause them to be welcomed by all, Christian or non-Christian, to whom they are adequately presented. It is our privilege and duty to proclaim and embody them in word and in deed.

To the liberal Christian missionary all forms of world-faith are as so many sisters engaged in a noble rivalry for the highest and best. Which shall ultimately dominate the others by virtue of its innate superiority, its better doctrine, or more ardent service, or whether all shall ultimately blend their joint contributions in one syncretic system of universal religion, adequate for all human needs and accepted by all men alike, who can foretell?

But one thing is sure, the religions of the world may learn from and help each other, while there are millions of human beings still sunk in appalling animalism, ignorance, and superstition, whom no religion worthy of the name has yet reached. Here is the opportunity and need for the liberal Christian missionary. He will discern that the best way to advance the coming of an absolute and universal religion is to remain faithful to his own form of belief in its larger implications and possi-

bilities. Loyal to his own spiritual heritage, he will believe that the simple and spiritual teachings of Christ, interpreted in the light of twenty centuries of Christian development, have still in them the power to become the way, the truth, and the life for multitudes of the children of men.

A bright Japanese writer has summed up the attitude of his people towards Western ideas, sciences, and practical arts, in the three expressions, "Adopt, Adapt, Adept." Even so the wise teacher of religion will not be content with a mere acceptance of his own cherished faith, he will aid in making it native to them, and a second nature.

Presented in such a spirit, our liberal Christian message will assuredly be given a hospitable reception. It will not encounter the suspicion and hostility which attended nearly every introduction of orthodox Christian sentiments, especially on the part of the upper and more intelligent classes.

The best results will not be those gained abroad, but the beneficent reaction of all this missionary service on the life and character of our Unitarian churches at home. It will lift the horizon of their thought and sympathy, preserving them from petty and provincial aims; it will impart to them a new consciousness of the worth of the religion they profess; it will inspire them with an enthusiasm, a sense of God in us and with us, which is the reassuring sign of a healthy, religious life. Finally it will unite us more closely to our brethren in all churches and lands who labor for the uplift of mankind in knowledge, righteousness, and faith, and enable us to feel that we are doing

our part to make, not only ourselves, but the world, wiser, better, and happier in the knowledge of God and the service of man.

To such a work we are called to-day in Japan and China, India, and the Philippines, in Africa, and in many a nominally Christian land where the light of a free, rational, and truly spiritual faith, has not yet, or but imperfectly, penetrated. The same considerations that prompt us to extend our faith at home should lead us to promote it abroad, until our own and every nation comes to know and worship God in the freedom of truth, the love of righteousness, and the hope of life eternal.

OUR ATTITUDE TOWARD FOREIGN MISSIONS

THE REV. FREDERICK A. BISBEE, D. D.
Editor Universalist Leader, Boston

OUR attitude as religious liberals, towards foreign missions is not the same as it was fifty years ago. There have been changes. Foreign missions have changed in their motive and method, and we have changed radically in our attitude.

But a very few years ago the Universalist would not even listen to the plea for foreign missions; he wanted nothing to do with them, they had no place in his thinking. Foreign missions stood for an attempt to save people from a hell which did not exist; they stood for the destruction of all that was sacred in the religious lives of other peoples, the wiping of the slate clean and the substitution, which was to be forced upon people with the awful penalty of everlasting punishment if not accepted. With such a conception Universalists would have nothing to do and turned their backs on the whole enterprise.

But then there came the changes; in the actual work of the missions, those who were working in foreign fields were far better than their creeds. Realizing the futility of preaching a gloomy theology, they grasped the glorious opportunity of preaching the gospel; telling the Good News, and

putting it into practice. Then came the ministry of Christian service: schools and hospitals sprang into being and the foreign people began to see that this is religion, which serves in the spirit of the Master.

Then came the changes in the attitude of the Universalist; here was a work which appealed to him, and the more he thought about it, the greater the sense of obligation, for he said this work is not to save from a future Dantean hell, but it is just to help men and women just like ourselves; to give out of our abundance to those who have little. And upon the Universalist Church more than any other comes the obligation to go forth into all the world and preach the Good News, because more than any other Church, the Universalist has the Good News to preach.

Here are new conditions carrying new opportunities and new duties; no longer are foreign missions to be looked upon as a theological process of saving from a theological hell and into a theological heaven, but missions mean redemption from the evils of the world into the good things of the world; they mean not the destruction of all other religions which have nourished the souls of men, but the supplementing and filling out of these deficient religions with the fulness and glory of Christianity; foreign missions mean the unity of the human race and our mutual obligation, they mean that the gospel we preach is true.

Here is a new appeal, and in the words of Dr. Shutter: "Before the force of this new appeal, the old objections scatter like dead leaves before

the blasts of autumn. 'Our doctrine is not like the many, but like the few. The masses of the world cannot receive it!' Then strike out 'the Universal Fatherhood of God' from your declaration of faith! 'I believe in Home Missions but not in Foreign!' You believe in the gospel for one man, but not for another? Then strike out from your declaration, 'the Universal Brotherhood of Man.' 'There is so much to do at home, that we cannot do anything abroad!' Tell that to your merchants; tell them to develop their business at home, and not to send their ships across the sea. Their answer will be that they must take care of both; and that the more they do abroad, the more prosperous will they be at home! You do not believe in 'preaching our ideas to people who have religious ideas of their own.' Again I say, tell that to your merchants. Tell them to stop imposing modern machinery and clothing upon people who have for generations ploughed with a crooked stick and worn breach-clouts. Their answer will be that the world's progress demands exactly what they are doing; that it is better for people to have these appliances and learn to use them, whatever they may cast aside; that they will get on immeasurably faster with a sewing machine than with a polished splinter of bone! And this is the answer to-day to him who objects to foreign missions. The progress of the world, the development of the race, the advance of the nations, demands exactly what the modern missionary movement is doing; and we Universalists should be in the van-

guard of that progress instead of lingering listlessly in the rear."

Our point of contact with this mighty redemptive force at the present time, is our mission in Japan. We began late in our work; nearly one hundred years after the other churches were established in their various fields, but in the brief time we have been at work, we have made a creditable showing, and have commanded the respect of other workers, but what is of far more importance we have begun to command our own self-respect. We have seen the fruits of our efforts and behold they are good. And yet we have but touched the fringe of our opportunity.

But we make a great mistake if we fancy our work done when we have done our full duty to Japan. This is the *Universalist* Church; nothing less than the whole is enough. We cannot stop short of all the peoples on the face of the earth. By the very nature of our faith we must be the greatest missionaries the world has ever known. We must outbrow those smug and contented human handicaps who are content to keep their one little local church on the top of the earth. Universalists must be missionaries or the Universalist Church will perish from the face of the earth.

THE ATTITUDE OF THE CHRISTIAN
CHURCH TOWARD FOREIGN
MISSIONS

THE REV. J. PRESSLEY BARRETT, D. D.
Editor of The Herald of Gospel Liberty,
Dayton, Ohio

THE Missionary question compasses the circle of Christianity. It works from a common center outward and from the circumference toward the center. That is to say, the missionary idea begins in the home land—it leaps the seas, and beginning in the centers of heathenism, it works outward. It is much like the process of bridge building, which begins on both sides of the river and meeting on a common center, the work is completed. In building the Lord's Kingdom we begin at home, but go into all the world.

And ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth. (Acts 1:8)

The Church is essentially missionary because it is sent with the gospel to all benighted lands. It is not sent to teach science, philosophy, or mathematics, not even eugenics, but it is sent to declare Christ's message of salvation. We begin at home, but immediately go to others. The home and the foreign work go together to complete the ideal

Jesus gave in the great commission. Some have held that it is neither home nor foreign missions: it is simply *missions*. That may be plausible, but it is not scriptural. Jesus gave a twofold commission. One is in John 4: 35—

Lift up your eyes and look on the fields, for they are white already to harvest.

That is home work. The other commission is found in Mark 16: 15—

Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature.

That is foreign work.

We take it for granted that the attitude of the Christian Church toward home missions does not concern us in this paper, but we are to assert the attitude of the Christian Church toward foreign missions. Then—

1. *The attitude of the Christian Church toward foreign missions is one of sincere loyalty to our Leader, Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God.*

He is the Author of the great commission—He said:

Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every living creature.

To this command the Christian Church must be loyal or disloyal. If loyal, we must be foreign missionary in both spirit and practice; if disloyal, we cannot be even fairly, or intelligently, Christian.

The *go* of the gospel is the keynote of aggressive Christianity. If we are disloyal to Jesus, we will

most likely excuse ourselves from the task Jesus assigned to His Church, and be content to fold our hands in ease, ever ready to find fault with the men and women who are devotedly lending a hand in obedience to the Master's command. Loyalty is the test of obedience; disloyalty is the evidence of disobedience. The contrast is a marked one. We cannot be *omissionary*, *anti-missionary* and *missionary*. We must be one or the other.

The Christian Church, as a Bible loving people, chooses to obey the great commission by *going* with the gospel into the lands of darkness and degradation to plant the truth. It is not a matter of personal whim as to whether we shall be missionary or not. The command to be missionary is as binding as is the command to love one another. The *go* of the Church is not a matter of caprice, but of divine *urgency*—it must be done—it is the *must* of our Church life and activity. With our eyes open to the command, it is go and live, or stay and die—die of stagnation.

Wherever the genuineness of the gospel is accepted, the great commission is believed—it is the essential plank in the platform of Christian activity. Faith in it rests on two facts, viz.:

1. It is universally admitted to be not only the command of Jesus, but it is the embodiment of His Spirit—He first lived the command, crystallizing it in His own life, and gave it to His disciples to be worked among men. If we drop the great commission, we emasculate the gospel.

2. Another proof that the commission is divine, and the central thought for the Church of Christ,

is the fact that we have no instance in the history of Christianity where any church has been a great spiritual power in the world, and at the same time non-missionary in character. The talisman of success is the missionary spirit and work—the gospel for the world and the world for Christ is essentially the slogan of the Church.

II. *The attitude of the Christian Church toward foreign missions is one of love and sympathetic helpfulness toward her unfortunate brothers in the lands of darkness.*

God has ordained that the strong shall help the weak—lift up the hands which hang down, ever leading the people from darkness to light. No more honorable work, no work of greater blessing, has God given to men. It is not only a high privilege and a solemn duty thus to minister to the weak, but to the many who are conformed to the image of God's Son, the duty becomes a delight and the privilege a coveted opportunity. A people who refuse to minister to the spiritual needs of the heathen world could hardly be said to possess the spirit of Jesus Christ—because it was He who said:

Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature.

When Jesus saw the multitude hungry and helpless, He at once planned to feed them, being moved with compassion. Nor did He wait till the disciples had accumulated by their own labor a sufficiency to feed the multitude, but he asked that they might dedicate what they had to the great work of feeding the five thousand; and when they

had done so, He multiplied their gifts till they had more than enough to feed the famishing, for twelve basketfuls remained—much more than they had with which to begin the great mission of feeding the hungry. Jesus' compassion simply moved His great heart to work a miracle for the benefit of the perishing.

There is another famishing multitude—they are weak and helpless. Having ascended to heaven, Jesus gives the task of feeding the hungry in heathen lands to His disciples. He does not ask us to feed the hungry at our own charges. Rather He asks us to dedicate what we have and so give Him the opportunity to increase what we have to a sufficiency that shall be both enough for the heathen world and ourselves. It is ours to accept the challenge and undertake the work. The people must be fed on the Bread of Life. So far as the Christian Church is concerned, there is none other to do the work in hand—we must do it, or leave it undone to the humiliation of our Lord.

The Christian Church holds that the constraining love of Christ, filling our hearts and moving our wills and minds, will compel us to go to the highways and hedges of foreign lands and bring them in—into the fold of the Chief Shepherd.

And other sheep I have which are not of this fold.
(John 10:16)

Jesus does not make this work a condition of salvation. Rather He asks us to help the weak because He has saved us and made us heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ to an everlasting inheritance with the saints in light.

This is the basis of our call to service in His Church. He seeks to have us recognize our everlasting obligation, not merely to Him because we are saved, but He wants us to recognize our obligation to the lost for the same reason. He wishes to bring His people to a high state of life and service in His Kingdom, not that we may be busy, but that we may help others into the same joyous life and light. When He saved us, He introduced us into a new life—a life of love and service. A sense of salvation brought to us through Jesus Christ, places upon us the responsibility of unselfish service in winning this world for Him.

In ante-bellum days it was customary now and then to sell slaves. On one occasion, in New Orleans, a northern man was passing the slave market. He saw a colored woman weeping. Approaching her, he asked the cause of her tears. She answered: "Dey is going to sell me from my husband and children, and I do not know who will be my master." He comforted her by saying: "Well, do not cry." It was poor comfort, but passing on, he soon returned to find this woman "on the block," being sold to the highest bidder. He began to bid, and at length his bid purchased the woman. As she came from "the block," she came crying in anguish. The same man again asked why she was crying. Again she said, "Dey has sold me from my husband and children and I do not know who is my master." Then he said: "Dry your tears—I have bought you, and I now give you freedom forever!" Immediately she fell

before him, and hugging his feet, she said: "*Then I will be your servant forever!*" That incident illustrates the attitude of the Christian Church toward foreign missions on the basis of real gratitude—that is, because Jesus has saved us, we can but fall at His feet and pledge Him to do our best for the salvation of the heathen world in grateful recognition of His work for us.

We do not serve as an *inducement* to save us, but we do serve because *we have been saved*—because the gospel has been given to us.

III. *The attitude of the Christian Church toward foreign missions is both in the interest of the heathen world and the preservation of its own life and activity.* If we do not Christianize the heathen they may heathenize us.

Our interest in the salvation of the heathen is twofold:

First, To give the gospel to all the world.

Second, To preserve the life and activity of the Church at home. At first glance, it may seem an overdrawn idea, but it is not—it will stand the closest examination. The basis for this conception of the mission work, as being as important for the home land as for the heathen, we get from the great commission and the context, given in the last chapter of the Gospel according to Mark. Almost every Christian has read the great commission and is more or less familiar with it, but not so with the context, which makes the foreign mission work quite as essential for the preservation of the life and activity of the Church as it is for the salvation of the heathen world. The one is

as truly involved as the others. We go a step further. Jesus gave the great commission under circumstances which seem to indicate that He had in mind the welfare of the Church as truly as He did the saving of the heathen. Let us examine the facts.

In Mark 16: 11, we read—

And they, when they heard that he was alive, and had been seen of her, believed not.

And in verse 13 we read—

And they went and told of it unto the residue; neither believed they them.

Again in verse 14 we read—

Afterward he appeared unto the eleven as they sat at meat, and upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen him after he was risen.

Immediately following this declaration Jesus gave the foreign mission commission, saying—

Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature.

Now we are in possession of the facts. Jesus found the infant Church full of unbelief. He knew He must cure this unbelief, or it would destroy the spiritual power and usefulness of the Church.

The great commission was his antidote for unbelief and hardness of heart. He gave them the great task then not only to save the heathen, but to keep themselves alive and active. If the Church should fail at home or abroad, it would be disastrous to the interests of the Kingdom everywhere.

It seems to be quite sure, then, that Jesus was deeply concerned for the spiritual health of His

Church, as well as He was for the men and women who were submerged in heathen darkness. The heathen need salvation, and the Church is the only agency Jesus has chosen for sending the gospel message to them. If the Church be paralyzed through its unbelief, then He loses His only opportunity, so far as we know, for reaching the unsaved, and at the same time the Church goes down in defeat because of its unbelief. No wonder then that Jesus gave the great commission in most positive language. There was no room for any "ifs" or "maybe sos" in the case—the world must be evangelized! His Church, now already paralyzed by unbelief, was His means of speeding the truth to the ends of the earth. At all costs the Church must be saved from its own unbelief, that it may win the heathen from sin, ignorance, degradation, and eternal death. The great commission thus became the life-giving touchstone for saving the Church and rescuing the heathen. It therefore seems true that the commission was given as much in the interest of the one as the other.

IV. *The attitude of the Christian Church toward foreign missions is that of an expectant bride, preparing for her wedding.*

The true Church is preparing herself as the Bride of Christ. She is His fiancée—she is preparing for His coming. By and by it will be proclaimed—

THE MARRIAGE OF THE LAMB IS COME AND HIS WIFE HAS MADE HERSELF READY.

It may be asked: "What is meant by the Church making herself ready?"

Her work is twofold:

1. *Purification and full consecration.*
2. *The giving of the gospel to all the world.*

These two great ends, in the destiny of the Church, must be accomplished before the marriage supper can be given. Neither the Church, nor the heathen world, can enter upon the blissful inheritance with her Bridegroom till these two ends are gained, the last of which cannot precede the first—the Church must make herself ready before the heathen world can be evangelized. The purity of the Church must be the basis of her power in spreading the truth. Christ is seeking a glorious Church, as His agent, to reach and win the heathen. When cleansed of every spot, wrinkle, and blemish of sin, the Church will be ready to evangelize the nations and she will do it speedily; after which will come the wedding of the Bridegroom and His Bride. At present the Church is working at her task at a poor dying rate—for every convert she is winning in heathen lands, seventy children come into the world on heathen soil. Alas, for the limitations of our work. When may we expect the marriage of the betrothed parties?

The end of this age cannot come till the gospel of the Kingdom has been preached in all the world. So Jesus taught. Hear Him:

And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come. (Matt. 24: 14)

It is not the Bridegroom, but the lack of readiness on the part of the Bride, that is delaying the

delightful day of His coming. The Church, His Bride, delays the coming of her Bridegroom—delays by reason of her indifference—and that is sin—in this day of light. All things are ready, except the Church—her mission remains incomplete and keeps Jesus waiting.

All Heaven bursts her stony floors,
And strews her lights below,
And deepens on and up! The gates
Roll back and far within
For me the Heavenly Bridegroom waits—
To make me one with Him.

BIBLICAL LITERATURE

BIBLICAL INTERPRETATION AS RELATED TO PRIVATE JUDGMENT

THE REV. MARTYN SUMMERBELL, LL. D.
*President Palmer Institute-Starkey Seminary,
Lakemont, N. Y.*

THE main break of the Reformers of the Sixteenth Century with Rome arose from their contention for the right of private judgment in the interpretation of Holy Scripture. Both Protestant and Romanist were in full accord as to the authority of the Bible. To both it was the Word of God, sacred and infallible; but the Romanist insisted that it must be interpreted by the Church, as represented by the priest, the bishop, and the Pope; while to the contrary, Luther and Calvin stoutly rejoined that each individual believer must determine for himself the meaning of the sacred Book. To reach this meaning he might have wise counsel from good books or worthy men, but the final judgment as to what God was saying to his soul, by help of the Bible, he must decide for himself. In this final conclusion conscience must be his guide, and in its verdict he was not to be controlled, or dictated to, by any set or clique of men whatever. This liberty of conscience in the interpretation of Scripture is the basic principle of Protestantism, and for this reason it is the special point of attack by all the theologians who

defer to the decrees of the Council of Trent, and who submit to the supremacy of the Roman pontiff.

In the foregoing statement three considerations are plainly involved:

First, that the teachings of Scripture require interpretation;

Second, that these teachings of Scripture are authoritative in the Church and over the individual conscience; and

Third, that in the interpretation of Scripture, if the procedure is to be legitimate, it must be constructive and not destructive; and that the intent must be to ascertain the mind of God as revealed in His Holy Word, and not to discover ways and means to nullify the force of the divine message.

A proper discussion of these propositions would fill a volume. For the present it must suffice to condense the argument into the briefest form.

As to the view that Holy Scripture requires interpretation, there can be little question. When the treasurer of Candace, Queen of Abyssinia, was riding in his chariot and reading from Isaiah the prophet, and Philip, the evangelist, asked if he understood what he was reading, he had to say, "How can I, except some man should guide me?" On one occasion Jesus put a question to the Pharisees in reference to the expression in the Psalms, "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool." The question which Jesus put was, "If David then call him Lord, how is he his son?"

That was a matter for interpretation, but not a soul of them could answer Him a word. The Bible is a wonderful Book. It contains histories and poems, codes of civil and ecclesiastical law, directions for duty and life, and revelations of the greatest truths which touch man in all his relations of the present and the future. Some of these teachings are so simple that a child can comprehend them, and some are so profound that they baffle the comprehension of the wisest philosophers. Some teachings of the Book are literal, and some are plainly figurative. For the right understanding of these there must be careful reading, and a prudent balancing of truth with truth, and of statement with statement, so as to reach the mind of the Spirit as it seeks to convey an intelligent direction of the mind of the disciple. Often what the Scripture seems to say is not at all what it is actually saying. When Jesus says: "I am the door of the sheep," we have no trouble in seeing the fact which He discloses, and we see at once that the statement is not literal, but highly figurative. One day He was in the temple at the Passover festival, and uttered that startling statement, "Destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up." Those who stood about supposed that He spoke of Herod's temple in which they were congregated, but John, who reports the incident, explains, saying, "But he spoke of the temple of his body." At a later time Peter inquired of the Lord respecting John, "And what shall this man do?" The Master evaded a direct reply, and said, "If I will that he tarry till I come, what is

that to thee? Follow thou me." With common consent, the disciples assumed that John was not to suffer the common fate of mortality, but that was a mistaken exegesis. And so John once more makes explanation in the passage, "Yet Jesus said not unto him, He shall not die; but, If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?"

So, Biblical interpretation is necessary, and is practically forced upon us at every reading of the Bible. Consciously or unconsciously we must weigh and decide for ourselves the meaning and relations of words with words, and of statements with statements. In this interpretation we must decide whether some of the things that we read are of present force, or whether they belong to an order that has become obsolete with the lapse of time and the change of circumstance. We recognize a succession of dispensations, the patriarchal, the priestly, the prophetic, and the gospel dispensations. Through them all the one God ruling in all has been the same, and the power of a spiritual religion has been the same; but some duties and observances which were required in the days of Noah, or of Ezra the priest, or of Malachi the prophet, are not in vogue in this day of the reign of the Lord Christ. This is not to say that the Old Testament is unprofitable, or that its lessons are to be abrogated in the Church; but only that in our interpreting the Word we are to discriminate between the teachings of the Bible that are in consonance with the revelation of the present dispensation, and those other "command-

ments and ordinances," "written and engraven on stones," and which under Christ are "done away."

Interpretation is also to counsel us respecting those requirements of Scripture which are of a purely local and restricted character. In the Book of Exodus there are requirements of Scripture in the way of food, and of household economics, which naturally pertain to the desert pilgrimage, and which are hardly adapted for all time, or to circumstances of a wholly different character. Probably the same remark would hold in the matter of Paul's prohibition of woman taking part in the church service. He was writing to Corinth, a city where such freedom, if practiced by women, would lead to unpleasant and unprofitable conclusions as to their moral character. Certainly at Caesarea no such restriction of the religious activity of woman was practiced, for we are told of Philip the evangelist, whose home was in that place, that he had "four daughters, virgins, which did prophesy," which means that they were accustomed to speaking in meeting.

Interpretation also sets a right estimate upon the relative value of the expressions of Scripture. It is true that some excellent people do not understand at first glance that any difference should be conceded between the various portions of Scripture, for in their apprehension every verse in the Bible is equally inspired. But letting that pass without debate, it must be remembered that the inspiration may be of several kinds; it may be the inspiration that announces a prophecy, or the inspiration that discloses a new truth, or the

inspiration which guarantees the statement of an historical fact. There must be a difference in spiritual value between the doctrinal declaration of Jesus, "I will not leave you comfortless, I will come unto you," and His word to Zacchaeus, "Make haste and come down; for to-day I must abide at thy house." There must be a difference in value between Paul's statement, "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit," and that word respecting the unbelieving wife, for as to the latter he expressly declares that he speaks his own opinion, and not the voice of the Lord. And so again, when the Scripture reports the sayings of Jesus, or of Peter, or of Balaam, or of Satan, such sayings are to be accorded the value belonging to each. Satan in the garden tells our first mother, "Ye shall not surely die," but he utters a base falsehood, and interpretation recognizes it as such. Inspiration certifies that this was what Satan said, but interpretation discloses the value of the utterance, and the sad result of Eve's overconfidence in the adversary.

Still again, it is the province of interpretation to weigh the content of words, and give them their proper estimate in relation to the entire content of revelation. Every thoughtful person who reads his Bible with any kind of care speedily perceives that the same word has varying senses, and that he must interpret its force according to the context. "Damnation" is a very hard word, and sometimes signifies the uttermost judgment of

God. But it would be a serious error to regard it as always conveying that meaning. In the thirteenth chapter of Romans that word is used by the writer to express the adverse judgment of a civil court. The word "hate" is a hard word and yet the loving Jesus uses it, as in the fourteenth chapter of Luke to express a minor preference. And so God speaks in Malachi, and Paul quotes the word in the ninth of Romans, "Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated." Interpretation here shows that "Jacob" means the people of Israel, and "Esau" the descendants of his line, and that God made choice of His own people in preference to the children of Esau.

Interpretations of this sort, which weigh the words and expressions of the Bible so as to learn God's message to the human soul, is legitimate and necessary. It was this sort of "study" that Paul recommended to Timothy, the pursuit of which was to render him "approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed."

The second proposition, that the teachings of Holy Scripture are authoritative in the Church and over the individual conscience is self-supporting. If God is to rule in His kingdom, His messages must reach His people. The media He has employed to convey His Word have been the voices of the patriarchs, prophets, apostles, and of the Lord Jesus. What they declared, as they spoke "of the Holy Ghost," has been recorded in the Bible. Apart from this Book there is no supreme authority in the Church. True, the Church of Rome claims to be the supreme authority, but

when it comes to that, its voice in its great councils has been vacillating and contradictory, and in consequence it cannot be accepted as a trustworthy guide. Outside of the Bible, as a safe spiritual counselor, as a sure revelation of spiritual truth, and as a certain assurance of eternal hope, we have nothing. Without the Bible as authority we would walk in an inextricable maze, with thick darkness about and before. No standard would be left us for moral conduct, no comfort in trial, and no solace for our grief. The Bible only points the way to present peace, and lifts the veil that overhangs the future, and bestows the blessing of God's exceeding precious promises. It is upon the Bible as our sure foundation that the believing Christian stands, and while he holds that position he is able to challenge all allied forces of sin and death, and to rejoice in the conflict, for he knows that nothing in all the world is so certain as the triumph of his Lord.

The third proposition, that in the interpretation of Holy Scripture the procedure must be constructive and not destructive, that the intent must be to ascertain the mind of God in His Holy Word, and not to discover ways and means to nullify the force of the divine message, follows as a direct inference of the second proposition. For if it be granted that the Bible is the ultimate authority, then its voice must be authoritative. Allow interpretation its utmost limit, and if it be real interpretation, it can do no more than make plain and clear what in the sacred Book in its present form seems vague and obscure. When the Book

has definite instruction to give, and when it speaks the word, that word is final. Explanations which explain away the grip of the divine message are foreign to the faithful disciple. Criticism which opposes the Spirit of Jesus and breaks down the defences of the faith, is to be recognized for what it is, a menace to the faith, and an anti-Christ. Other criticism, which opens up the treasures of God's Word, which makes crooked things straight and rough places plain, which helps the believer to a larger trust and a more lively sense of duty, is to be welcomed and commended.

Here, then, is the province of private judgment in the interpretation of Holy Scripture: to find what God is revealing in His Holy Word for the soul of the disciple, and to receive the divine message and by its help grow into the complete and noble Christian life.

MODERN BIBLICAL CRITICISM

THE REV. CRAWFORD H. TOY, LL. D.

Professor in Harvard University

THE word "criticism" is used in a broader and in a narrower sense. In the broader sense, in which it means any judgment on the facts of life, it is loosely equivalent to "science." More precisely, science is exact and systematized knowledge, and criticism is the judgment based thereon. But no science is perfectly exact, and no criticism is perfectly correct. Man's effort to understand the world has been going on since the beginning of human life, and his judgments have become clearer with the growth of the power of exact observation and with the accumulation of details. He has always been a student and a critic, growing older with each generation and learning to study more wisely. The primitive savage and the child have their opinions of things; the difference between Caliban and Newton is one of degree, not of kind. The nineteenth century is not "*the age of criticism*," but only the latest stage of human inquiry, when man's curiosity is keener and his means of research better than ever before.

The terms "criticism" and "critical" are therefore properly applicable to any sort of study. We may speak of "critical philosophy" or "critical astronomy," meaning thereby philosophical or

astronomical systems, based on exact analysis of facts. But they have come to be used also with special reference to the origin of books, the determination of their date, authorship, and constitution. Many books have come into existence at times and under circumstances when no record was made of their birth and growth,—such as ancient poems and religious works, Hindu, Persian, Chinese, Babylonian, Hebrew, Greek, and later, Icelandic, German, French, Anglo-Saxon. These grew up like the strata of the earth's crust, when there was no eye to witness and no hand to record the successive formations and depositions. It is the task of the science of criticism to penetrate the obscurity of their beginning and tell the story of their growth.

This science is not the creation of our day, though it is now fuller, rounder, and better entitled to the name of science than ever before,—just as our physics, chemistry, astronomy, geology, and all the exact sciences are better equipped and more effective than they were thirty or twenty or ten or two centuries, or even fifty years ago. It began, though feebly, long ago. Some centuries before the beginning of our era, the Alexandrian critics questioned whether the whole of the *Iliad* was the work of Homer, and whether the same man produced both the *Iliad* and the *Odyessy*. What the Greeks might under other circumstances have done towards building up a science of criticism, we cannot tell. After the Roman empire became Christian, literary energy was absorbed in theological discussion, and

the old Greek people ceased to exist. It took many centuries for the barbarian conquerors of Europe to acquire literary training, and criticism did not show itself till poetry had reached its prime. Just after Milton's death, two famous literary feats were performed in England by Hody and Bentley. The former demolished the story of the pretended Epistle of Aristeeas, that the Hebrew Scriptures were translated into Greek at Alexandria by seventy-two men sent from Palestine at the request of the king of Egypt. The latter showed that the so-called Epistles of Phalaris, purporting to have been written in the sixth century before Christ, were forgeries, and belonged to a much later time. Since Bentley's day, and especially within the last century, an enormous mass of critical work has been done on the old epic poems of Greece, India, and Germany, the sacred books of the Persians, Hindus, and Mohammedans, on Shakespeare and other poets, and in ancient and modern history.

Of this great movement Biblical criticism forms a part. It is simply the application of scientific critical methods to the writings of the Old and New Testaments. It, too, has a long history. In the first centuries of our era both Jews and Christians had much to say about the character and authorship of certain books. Jewish authorities refused to admit the Book of Enoch into the canon, and probably, therefore, decided that it was not composed by the old patriarch from whom it purports to come. The Church Fathers debated the origin of the Epistle to the Hebrews and other

New Testament books. Somewhat later, Aben Ezra and other Jews began the criticism of the Pentateuch. Martin Luther spoke with his usual frankness of the merits and demerits of various parts of Old Testament and New Testament. During the past two centuries Biblical criticism has been pushed in earnest, moving hand in hand with its sister sciences. Its steady, thoughtful advance is a sign of its reasonableness; there is nothing spasmodic in it, no break with the past. If its latest results seem revolutionary, this is only because its history is not kept in view. And the same remark applies to chemistry, astronomy, philology, and every other science.

ITS SPIRIT

The term "destructive," often applied to the Biblical criticism of our day, is in one sense true, in another sense untrue and misleading. It is true of this science in the same way in which it is true of every other science. The astronomy of our day has destroyed a part of that of Ptolemy, Copernicus, and Newton. Alchemy and old chemistry have vanished before the new chemistry. All discovery of truth must be at the same time destruction of error. A great part of all human progress, in the individual and in the community, consists in throwing away mistakes. But it is evident that this process of destruction is undertaken in the interests of truth, and that it results in building up something better than what has been destroyed. The good in the past is preserved, and something is added to it. Scientific progress is

always relative, never attaining perfection; but it gives the world something better than had been known before. It does not set itself to destroy; it only permits the fall of a structure whose foundations have given way.

All this is true of Biblical criticism. It destroys old beliefs, not for the sake of destroying, but because it would supersede the old by a better new. It is bold because it is reverent. It values truth too highly to sacrifice it to any opinion, however supported by tradition or hallowed by associations. This statement will appear to some persons to be self-evident; but there are others who seem to think that, while other sciences are good, this one is irreverent and malignant. Yet who can recall the names of the great critics, Spinoza, Lowth, Astruc, Schleiermacher, De Wette, Ewald, Baur, Hupfeld, Bleek, Reuss, Delitzsch, Weiss, and suppose that they have been influenced by hostility to anything good? We may regret the loss of Romulus, Semiramis, and William Tell, but we will not accuse the critical historian of unfriendliness to these personages; and in the same spirit we should accept the transference of Joseph and Esther from history to legend and fable. Great indignation was roused by Bentley's attack on the pretended Phalaris letters. But all the world knows that Bentley was a true lover of Greek literature, and did it a service by putting these letters in their proper place. No one has ever doubted Lachmann's devotion to the old Greek and German poetry. Yet he spent a great part of his life in cutting the *Iliad* and the

Nibelungen to pieces. These scholars were not unfeeling, nor can that term be justly applied to the modern critic who undertakes to dissect the Pentateuch into its parts and assign to each its date and origin. It is simply a question of historical fact. The critic may be wrong in his conclusions, and must then be proved wrong by critical argument; but, in any case, his first duty is not to the Pentateuch or the Iliad or any other book as such, but only to fact.

ITS RESULTS

1. In the first place, criticism has made a considerable addition to our knowledge of history by introducing something like order into material which had before lain in a chaotic and unintelligible shape. The way in which the old Jewish literature came into existence was not favorable to clearness of arrangement. The utterances of prophets were sometimes not committed to writing and collected till after their death. Histories, philosophical disquisitions, and poems were usually published anonymously, or the names of the authors were lost, less interest being felt in the authorship than in the contents. The modern sense of literary ownership hardly existed at all. Editors made additions to manuscripts according to their own ideas of fitness; and scribes combined different writings in one manuscript for various literary and scribal reasons,—from supposed agreement of contents, or to fill out a manuscript, or on the authority of some oral tradition.

Then, further, when the Jewish scholars set about collecting the books into canons, the controlling consideration with them was not chronology or authorship, but what they conceived to be their value for the religious life of the nation, and this at a time when the nation had almost become a church. First, the legal books were collected, then the prophecies and earlier histories, then, in the second century before Christ, the poetry and later histories and other books. This was the Palestinian arrangement; but the Greek translators in Egypt changed it by throwing all the histories together, and putting the prophets after the poetry. It is not surprising that, with such manipulation, nearly all traces of orderly historical arrangement were lost. The task of criticism is to break up these mechanically united masses, give each part its proper place, and vindicate the true unity of the whole. If it succeeds, it adds new chapters to the political, religious-ethical, and literary history of the world.

The political life of the old Israelites was meagre and of little interest; but it appears that there was a gradual progress from lawlessness to civil organization, from tribal isolation to national unity, and that royalty came naturally out of the felt needs of the people (Gideon, Saul).

Perhaps the most striking result of Biblical critical study is the clear view it gives us of the history of Israelitish religion,—the banishment of the disjointed and unsymmetrical, and the exhibition of continuous progress. Not the wonderfulness, but the disorderliness, has been got rid of, so

that we see the great religious idea of Israel ever taking fuller and more beautiful shape. In the dim distance, a vague polytheism; then, as the nation grows into unity, a crude and narrow devotion to the national deity, with struggles against foreign worships,—purification of the conception of God keeping pace with the advance of ethical feeling, and enlargement of the ceremonial usage following in the track of social-political organization; intensity of national self-consciousness and of the monarchial idea of government leading to practically pure monotheism (in the time of the exile), and then a parallel development of ethics and ritual (the Levitical law), and the passage of the broken nation into a church. This history is not unlike that of other national religions, but it is specially interesting to us because of the fulness of details extending over a long period of time, and because of the great part that Israelitism has played in our civilization. New Testament criticism shows us how Paul's idea of Christianity stood over against the Jewish-Christian view (James), how there were various conceptions of the nature and work of Jesus (Matthew, Paul, Fourth Gospel), and how the constitution and government of the Church were modified (Paul, Pastoral Epistles).

Our literary gain from criticism is twofold. We understand more clearly the historical development of the literature, and we feel more deeply its aesthetic power. The general order in the Old Testament is, folk-songs and stories of ancestors, small law-books, prophetic orations, continuous

histories, lyric and philosophical poetry, great collections of laws and of traditions of primeval times; that is, first the spontaneous and naive, and then the reflective, organized, and scientific,—an order that commends itself as natural as soon as it is proved to be true.

Time was when few people thought of the Bible as having literary charm; now it seems likely to get its rights. As interpolations are removed, unlike things separated and like brought together, and the proper historical setting given, we are coming to see the excellence of the Hebrew prose narrative style, unsurpassed for freshness and vividness, the eloquence of the prophets, and the beauty of the poetry. We shall feel the moral power of these writings not less, but more, for enjoying the literary charm. In the New Testament, the Epistles of Paul, with their eloquent treatment of doctrine and ethics, stand to the narratives of the Synoptic Gospels, somewhat as the Old Testament prophets to the exilian historical books; then come the earlier portions of the Apocalypse, later Epistles treating new questions, the more reflective history of the Book of Acts, and the idealizing portraiture of the Fourth Gospel. Here, also, is a natural order that gives more living power to the moral element of the New Testament.

2. It is a still greater service of criticism that it helps to increase the moral power of the Bible by humanizing it. Here is a great literature whose deepest and best influence has been maimed by the false position forced on it. The Bible has

been treated as an artificial book, its authors only seemingly alive. A wall has been built between it and human life. It has been dissected into texts till its human spirit has almost vanished. When we deplore the loss of its best influence, we do not mean that it has hitherto been without influence. On the contrary, we know that it has wielded immense power, and largely for good. But this power was based on the outward authority ascribed to the book as being a direct verbal revelation from God, whence also the artificial treatment of it as a hand-book of doctrine. No doubt this external stamp of authority gave it power, but not the best power. Its true authority is its appeal to the human soul. The divine that is in it approves itself most perfectly when it issues from true human souls capable of manifesting the divine. It is living men and their thought that we want, for it is in this that we find help in the struggle towards the divine. Any book which takes hold of our human sympathies must find entrance into the soul, and, if it have real moral power, will penetrate and transform us with its spirit in a way far surer and completer than it could attain by a voice of command.

Criticism enables us to see in the Bible the souls and words of real men. We can trace the processes by which ideas and books came into existence. We can distinguish perplexities and doubts and the ways in which practical difficulties were overcome. The very simplicity of much of the material helps us to feel its naturalness. * * * * * Criticism is thus only an introduction to some-

thing better. Its object is to invest this section of human history with life. One who gets near to this ancient life will appropriate its ideal, and bear about with him in his own soul a purifying presence nobler and stronger than any word of outward command.

3. It is well to remember also that the modern criticism rids the friends of the Bible of certain inconveniences and unseemlinesses. Those of us who look on this book as a great literary and moral-religious classic of the world, and wish to see its power increased, have frequent occasion to deplore the manœuvres of attack and defense. One man laughs at the geology and astronomy of the Bible, and then sneers at the whole book; or he finds some moral crudeness, as the slaughter of the Canaanites or David's crimes, and seems unable to find anything else. To him then replies some defender who seeks to prove the accuracy of Biblical physical science, and to show how God might reasonably command wholesale carnage, and how David might be a man after God's own heart. All this is lamentable. The occasion and possibility of these attacks and defenses disappear as soon as we look on the Old Testament as the literature of an ancient nation, which grew from barbarism to culture, embodied in its writings all the phases of its life, and ascribed to divine command all its achievements. We may smile at the geology of Genesis and the astronomy of Joshua, as we may at the scientific ideas of Bacon and Milton; we may see David in his true light as a brave, cruel Oriental monarch, idealized by a later age

into a model of piety; and we may justly regard the exterminating laws against the Canaanites (which were never carried out) as signs of an ethically rude age. But these things must stand by themselves, and do not affect the value of the better part of the Bible. The Israelites no doubt practiced barbarities in war; it was the manner of the time. The Old Testament does not reach the idea of kindness to foreign enemies; that is a defect in its ethics. The prophets are ethically narrow: their judgment of characters and events is usually determined simply by what they think the good of the nation; and they regard their own opinions as divine revelations. In like manner, the New Testament is not freed from ethical limitation. But when we put aside these scientific and ethical imperfections, there still remains a great moral ideal which we must recognize and honor. If we criticize the errors of the Bible, let it be with the reverence and tenderness with which we criticise the weaknesses of a great man.

There is one moral gain brought by criticism that should be specially emphasized. Great harm has been done by the indiscriminate defense of these crude Biblical statements and ideas, historical inaccuracies, discrepancies, imperfect scientific and ethical ideas,—“difficulties” they are called, though this they are only from a certain point of view. One can easily understand why some religious men should wish to deny them and explain them away. They act under the control of a theory of inspiration which declares that there can be no errors in the Bible, and which

they think essential to religion. Their system of defense is intelligible, but its results are bad. He who undertakes, for example, to defend as inspired the vindictive feeling of certain of the Psalms (as 69, 109, 137) is trying to ascribe to God what he would not commend to the community, because he knows that the moral sense of our times would reject it. It does not help the matter to say that these imprecations are directed against the enemies of Israel as the enemies of divine truth, and are, therefore, nothing but prayers in the interests of humanity that truth may prevail. If this were a correct explanation (which it is not) it would still not justify these Psalms. Their spirit is contrary to that of the Sermon on the Mount and our consciences, as any one may see if he will only undertake to apply these imprecations to the vilest wretches and greatest enemies of religion at the present day. His lips would refuse to utter the words. Now there is no difficulty for one who looks on the Psalms not as the words of God, but as songs composed by pious but imperfect men. But, if they be held up as in any special sense divine, then there ensues a conflict between the religious ideal and the moral sense. The attempt to force harmony between things radically opposed is apt to warp the intellect as well as obscure the moral vision. It can never be good for a community to believe that the moral standard of a supposed word of God is below its own, or to try to believe that a procedure, now certainly wrong, was formerly in some inexplicable way made right by divine command.

We may sum up the moral-religious service of Biblical criticism in two words: it gives us the history of an attempt by former generations to interpret and perfect human life, and it leaves us free to choose from the Bible what can help us. Its first contribution is historical and archæological, its second touches the life of to-day. Its purpose is to separate between the transitory and the permanent, to distinguish the moral-religious essence and spirit of the Bible from the imperfect forms in which it clothed itself. It does not claim to have perfectly accomplished this purpose, but it hopes that a beginning has been made.

THE BIBLE IN OUR TIME

THE REV. JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

Minister Church of the Messiah, New York City

THE appearance of the English Bible, over three hundred years ago, is one of the most remarkable events in all the history of modern England. Mr. Green, in his *Short History of the English People*, makes the statement that "no greater moral change ever passed over a nation than passed over England during the years which parted the middle of the reign of Elizabeth from the meeting of the Long Parliament;" and he attributes this "moral change" almost exclusively to the translation of the Scriptures. "England," he says, "became the people of a book, and that book was the Bible."

It is almost impossible, in our day, when the Bible has long since become one of the most familiar commonplaces of the time, to understand the excitement which the first appearance of this book created in the nation, and the influence which it exerted upon the minds of the common people. The Scriptures, of course, had always been in existence; but read only by the priests, and then only in the Hebrew and the Greek, or perhaps the Latin Vulgate, they were almost as good as lost, so far as the people were concerned. But now the Bible was published by the authority of the king, it was appointed to be read in all the churches in

the English tongue, and copies were permitted to be owned and read within the home. It was like the discovery of a new literature to the masses of the people, and everywhere it was received with extraordinary enthusiasm. Thousands of men and women thronged the churches every Sunday, not to worship nor to pray, not to listen to the music nor the sermon, but only to hear the reading of the Old Testament and the New. The small Geneva Bibles carried the work into every home, and night after night the family would gather round the hearth and spell out, letter by letter, the words of the sacred text. An entire nation began reading the same book at exactly the same time and in exactly the same way; and, of course, the effect was simply amazing. Here were the English people, for the first time, introduced to the sublime and heroic story of the Children of Israel, the chosen people of the Most High; here were they made familiar with the raptures of the Psalms and the quiet wisdom of the Proverbs; here were they made to hear the fiery words of the ancient prophets, pleading in immortal tones for justice and righteousness upon the earth; here did they meet John the Baptist, and listen to his voice, crying in the wilderness for "repentance;" here did they follow Paul in his journeys among the Gentiles; here were they inspired by the acts of the apostles and uplifted by the revelations of the rapturous St. John; and here were they brought face to face with the Nazarene, and made, as it were, to be disciples in his train. Here, in a word, were they

introduced at first hand to the very origins of their religion, which had become so obscured and perverted by the teachings of the church. Here did they meet not the creeds and the rituals, not the dogmas and the rites, but the ten commandments, the beatitudes, the parables, and the epistles. And what wonder that the effect of this astounding revelation was the transformation of the entire nation! What wonder that the language became saturated with Scripture phrases, that new churches were everywhere organized on what was called the Scripture plan, that new ideals of education and morals, of government and religion were everywhere conceived, that the whole temper of the nation underwent a change, until the archbishop was beheaded, the king dethroned, and a new social structure reared upon the wreckage of the old! Never has any country undergone such a revolution as that which marked the transition from the reign of the Stuarts to that of Cromwell and his Puritans—it was a change not merely in the form of the government but in the whole character of the civilization—and behind this revolution there stands no single cause which is so conspicuous as that of the translation of the Scriptures into the native tongue. For the first time they were united by the bonds of a common speech and the contagion of a common spirit. In the space of a single generation, one English book became familiar to every Englishman in the land; and upon the foundation of this book was reared a new and greater England than the world had ever seen.

In the second place, as an explanation of the enormous influence of this book, we must remember that it gave to the English people not only a literature but a religion. This Bible was regarded, in the most literal way in the world, as the immediate work of God. As a natural consequence of this conception, the Scriptures became the sole guide and rule of life. Every question was tested by reference to Holy Writ. It made no difference whether it was the question of the dress that a woman should wear or the instruction that should be given to children, the organization of the churches or the observance of the Sabbath, the power of the priest or the authority of the king, it must in all cases be decided in accordance with the teachings of the Bible, for the Bible was regarded as the perfect and infallible revelation of the mind of God.

Whether we like it, or not, we are still obliged to recognize that the Scriptures no longer hold that position of influence and power which once was theirs. No longer can it be said that we are "the people of a book, and that book the Bible." On the contrary, the knowledge of the Scriptures which was possessed by the people of three centuries ago is not more remarkable than the ignorance of the Scriptures which is characteristic of the great majority of men and women at the present time. The Bible is still read in our churches and taught in our Sunday-schools. Millions of copies of the Bible still pour from our printing presses, and are scattered broadcast throughout the land. It is probably true that the

Bible is the "best seller," and has a wider distribution than any other book in the English language. But nothing is more evident, all the same, than the general neglect of the Scriptures by all classes of the population, and the deplorable lack of knowledge of the material which it contains. The Bible in our time is no longer the same unique and wonderful book which it was in the time of Oliver Cromwell and John Milton. No longer is it read with reverence and awe. No longer are its phrases the language of the time. No longer are its precepts the guide of daily life. The Bible, of course, so far as its own inherent qualities are concerned, is just the same book that it always was. But conditions and ideas have changed in the course of three centuries of time, and we find that those two facts, which, more than anything else, gave the Bible its position of supreme interest in the seventeenth century, no longer hold good at the present moment.

In the first place, the Bible no longer constitutes the entire literature of the English people. Since the day of its translation, one of the richest and most abundant literatures which the world has ever seen has appeared to glorify the English tongue. Not since the days of ancient Greece has humanity produced such a wealth of history, romance, poetry, and drama as England has given to the world during the last three hundred years.

The rapid increase of literature, however, would have had no effect, it seems to me, upon the extraordinary influence of the Bible, had it not been for another change which has taken place. If

the Scriptures were still regarded to-day, as they were yesterday, as "given by the inspiration of God to be the rule of faith and life," no flood of books from our presses, however overwhelming, could have dethroned the Bible from its position of supreme authority. But it goes almost without saying at the present time that the Scriptures are not so regarded. The churches still talk about divine revelation, and still point to the Bible as containing the "full and final and infallible" word of God. But the man on the street, whatever he may say, no longer takes this contention very seriously. The Higher Criticism after all has done its perfect work. The great majority of men and women may never have read a single word which has been written by any of these so-called Higher Critics. But the results of their investigations have gradually filtered down into the common mind, and the Bible stands forth to-day in its true character as a book of human origin, having value as a revelation not of the divine but of the human mind. The average man still has a certain reverence for the Bible which he does not bestow upon other books—a reverence which he has inherited from the past and which he manifests very frequently by not touching the book from one year's end to another. * * * * * The words of the Bible no longer fall upon the ears of the modern man as the words of God. Henceforth these words must make their own appeal and speak of their own power. They must win or lose, as they are better or worse than the words of other books. Never again will theories of divine origin and

authority give the Bible that position of transcendent power which it held in the days of its earlier translation.

* * * * *

I hold with Goethe that the Bible "is the greatest literary treasure of mankind." I hold with George Herbert, that the Bible "is a book to which no book can be compared for excellence." I hold with Thomas Carlyle, that "the Bible is true as no book ever was, or ever will be, true." I hold with Matthew Arnold, that men in all ages in the future as in the past "will ever return to the Bible, because they cannot do without it." So believing, I am confident that the Bible in our time is as great a treasure and as potent an influence as it ever was in the past. Stripped of all the superstition which once enshrouded it, and robbed of all the traditions which once maintained it, the Bible in our time is the same essential book that it has always been, and we have therefore nothing to fear for it, either in the present or in the future. Judging the Book now simply as a book, let us consider some of the ways in which it still must be regarded as among the greatest of all human productions.

Beginning on the very lowest plane, I would say that the Bible in our time is infinitely precious, simply and solely as a collection of historical documents. As James Martineau has put it, in one of his essays, these writings are "in the highest degree interesting as the earliest memorials of the most enduring race and the sublimest religion in all the world."

It is no mere accident that the birth of the founder of the Christian Church, by common consent, marks the end of ancient and the beginning of modern times. This date of the birth of Jesus and the simultaneous beginning of the Christian era marks an epoch in human history with which no other can be compared; and the rise of Christianity, through the last nineteen centuries, as the dominant influence in the development of the Western world, is an historical phenomenon which is unexampled in the experience of mankind. Now, of the origin of this religion, we know absolutely nothing save what is told us in the Gospels and in the epistles of St. Paul. Here, within the comparatively narrow bounds of our New Testament, is contained all the information that the world will ever possess about the beginnings of this movement, which all agree is of universal and eternal significance. Outside of these few writings, we know nothing of Jesus, nothing of Paul, nothing of Peter and John; and we could almost say that we should never know that such men had ever lived had not these writings been preserved to the present day. This being the case, does it not become evident at once that here in the New Testament we have historical documents of the very first importance? Does it not become evident that they are precious as no other official records are precious? Does it not become evident that, if all the historical documents which are now preserved to us should be destroyed in the inverse order of their importance, the New Testament

writings would be almost the last to be given to the flames?

In the second place, to move up a step higher, I hold the Bible to be infinitely precious in our time, not only from the standpoint of history, but also from the standpoint of literature—and this, from two entirely different points of view. First of all, there is contained, between the covers of this Book, one of the most wonderful collections of literature that the world has ever seen. Turn to the simple narratives of "Genesis" and "Exodus," of "Joshua" and "Judges," and here you have an abundance of material as valuable from the literary point of view as the legends of ancient Rome, or the myths of ancient Greece. Turn to the pages of "Samuel" and "Kings," and portions of "Ezra," "Nehemiah," and "Jeremiah," and here are historical writings which may favorably be compared with the more familiar works of Herodotus, Thucydides, and Tacitus. Where in all the literature of either ancient or modern times, can be found such an exquisite pastoral idyl as the "Book of Ruth?" Where, outside of the few titanic masterpieces of all the ages, such as the *Iliad* of Homer, the *Divine Comedy* of Dante, or the *Faust* of Goethe, can be found such a stupendous piece of work as the "Book of Job?" Where, in all the literature of all the ages, can be found such orations as those which are preserved in the prophecies of Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, and Jeremiah? Where such exaltations of practical wisdom as are to be found in the pages of the "Book of Proverbs?" Where such lyrics of the soul as the

poems and hymns in the "Book of Psalms?" Or turn to the New Testament,—and where among all the books that have ever been written, in any age or by any people, can be found pages of equal beauty with many of those in the Gospels of Jesus Christ, the epistles of St. Paul, and the "Revelation" of St. John?

But there is another point of view from which the Bible must be regarded as valuable as literature. I refer to the fact that the English-speaking people have in this authorized translation the greatest existing monument of their language. Entirely apart from the contents of the book itself, the language into which it was translated by the scholars of King James must remain so long as humanity endures as the model and perfection of English speech. It is needless for me to enlarge upon this point, when the praise of this translation has been sounded in the past, and is being sounded on every hand to-day, by all the best judges of the subject. It was a Catholic who said, that the language of the Authorized Version "lives on the ear like music that can never be forgotten." It was the most fastidious and cautious of modern critics who singled out a typical passage from the Old Testament, and characterized it as an example of "absolutely perfect English prose." It was Lord Macaulay who declared that "if anything else in the language should perish, the Bible would alone suffice to show the whole extent of its beauty and its power." What wonder that, amid the changing conditions and conceptions of the pres-

ent age, there are some of us who have no fear as to the abiding influence of this great book.

But let us move up still one more step, in our estimate of the Bible in our time, and with this step pass from the field of literature to the much wider and more important field of ethics and religion. From this point of view, the Bible stands before us to-day as the representative production of the finest genius of a religiously inspired people. The Hebrews, as has been so often said, had a genius for religion. They were unique, among all peoples who have ever dwelt upon the earth, as a race which was concerned not with the ordinary problems of war, or agriculture, or commerce, or politics, but first, last, and all the time, with the problems of religion. They dwelt, as no other people has ever dwelt, in the realm of things spiritual. They lived, as no other nation has ever lived, in the conscious presence of God. They wrestled, as no other people has ever wrestled, with the basic problems of the soul. Religion constituted their very life. It was the air which they breathed, and the soil upon which they trod. Their kings were the accepted rulers of the people, only because they were first the anointed and chosen representatives of Jehovah. Their statesmen were concerned not with the ordinary problems of statescraft and diplomacy, but only with the single problem of learning the will of God and guiding the nation in the path of obedience to that will. Their literature, as we can see to-day, was almost exclusively ethical and spiritual. Whereas with all other ancient peoples religion constituted

one part of the life of the individual and of the state, with the Jews it constituted the whole of this life. Everything else, whether politics, or war, or art, or social life, was but a subordinate expression of this one supreme reality. In this regard, as I have said, the ancient Hebrews were unique among all peoples. They had a genius for religion in the same way that the Romans had a genius for law and the Greeks for art. And just as Roman law is the foundation of all modern systems of government, and Greek art is the model of all modern architecture and sculpture, so is the religion of the Hebrew prophets, from Elijah to Jesus, the source of all modern religious thought.

Now, it must never be forgotten that it is the Bible which has preserved the achievements of the Hebrews in the realm of religion, just as it is the Code of Justinian which has preserved the achievements of the Romans in the realm of law, and the temples and statues of the Acropolis at Athens which have preserved the achievements of the Greeks in the realm of art. And just as the world to-day returns to this renowned Justinian Code as the enduring foundation of all political science, and to the ruins upon the Athenian hills as the abiding expression of the beautiful in art, so is the world beginning to understand more and more that it must return to the psalms and prophecies of the Old Testament, and to the Gospels and epistles of the New, as the culminating expression of the religious sentiments of humanity. Here do we find the heart of man in the full

flowering of its spiritual aspirations. Here do we find the human soul at the very flood-tide of its communion with the Divine. Here do we find the perfect expression of those wonderful conceptions of justice, righteousness, and love, which mark the farthest reaches of human idealism. Here, above all things else, do we find the words of those great religious leaders who surpass, not only in number but in sheer genius of spiritual insight, all others that could be named. When we want to know what we mean by God and the human soul, by our ideals of justice, righteousness, and peace, by our conceptions of love, good-will, and the brotherhood of man; when we want to know the best that has ever been said and the noblest that has ever been thought and the highest that has ever been dreamed about the deep things of the spirit, it is to the Bible that we must turn.

Now, it is from this ethical and spiritual point of view that the Bible, entirely apart from all theories of inspiration, assumes a significance far surpassing anything that can be said of any other book. It is here that we see what Matthew Arnold meant when he said that "men in all ages of the future, as in the past, will ever return to the Bible, because they cannot do without it;" and what Thomas Carlyle had in mind when he affirmed that "the Bible is true as no other book is, or ever can be, true."—It is only at certain wonderful moments that man is able to achieve the perfect; and, once done, there is little possibility, as there is no need, of repetition. Men will go on building temples and halls of state so long as the earth

endures, but the Parthenon will still remain the loftiest example of architectural achievement. Men will continue to carve statues of strength and beauty from the living marble so long as their fingers retain their cunning, but the reliefs of Phidias will never be surpassed. No greater symphony, in all human probability, will ever be written than Beethoven's fifth; no greater opera than Wagner's "Tristan and Isolde;" no greater epic than the *Iliad*; no greater drama than *Macbeth*. And so it is also with religion. Here, in the raptures of the psalms, in the prophecies of Isaiah, in the parables of Jesus, in the epistles of St. Paul, do we find the high-water mark of spiritual expression. Here every truth is spoken, every vision seen, every emotion registered. Here is the human soul, once and for all, brought face to face with God. Revelation was not sealed with the closing of the New Testament Canon; inspiration did not end with the first century of our era—prophets there have been since Paul perished in Rome and John expired on Patmos, and prophets there will be until the end of time. But still are the Scriptures the supreme and permanent and unapproachable expression of the soul's life. It is in this sense that men in the future, as in the past, will "ever return to the Bible because they cannot do without it." It is in this sense that the Bible "is true as no other book is, or ever can be, true."

It is in this sense that I am willing to affirm that the Bible is the "word of God."

RELIGIOUS PROGRESS

THE CHURCH OF THE FUTURE

THE REV. J. O. ATKINSON, D. D.

Editor Christian Sun, Elon College, N. C.

THE Church of the future is going to be different from the Church of the present. Its activities are going to be different. Its methods of work are going to be different. Its spirit of operation, co-operation, and fellowship is going to be different. We are even now in the period of transition, and the old methods, activities, pursuits are passing out.

First of all the Church of the future will be progressive. Christ was progressive. He was the original Progressive. He cut across the hard and fixed lines and traditions of His time. He broke away from prevailing codes and opinions. He lived a life of progress, development, and constant revelation.

If the Church is to keep pace with Christ it must go forward, onward, upward, meeting the actual moral and spiritual needs of the time. The Church which embodies the spirit of Christ, athrob and athrill with divine life, cannot stand still. Life means movement. The most romantic thing in the world is righteousness, and the pursuit of God's purposes and plans for us. The Church of our day is awakening to the fact that new enterprises must be undertaken, new plans laid, and new ideas put into practice, if it is to fulfil its God-given mission.

Furthermore, there is an awakening consciousness, on the part of the Church, that the followers of Christ must be one; not one in comity, but one in purpose, one in aim, one in sacrifice, one in sympathy, one in aggressiveness.

The absurdity of division and strife and schism and enmity is apparent, becomes more apparent constantly, and the feeling grows that Church members, for carrying out God's great plans, must get together with Jesus Christ as Leader. We agree with a recent writer who said that if the apostles of the early Church had separated on such insignificant themes as instrumental music, a missionary offering, the manner of observing the communion, the manner and mode of baptism, then the Church could not have survived the first century. We are learning that denominationalism was only a factor which the Church used in its own evolution toward Christ's ideal. In this development it may have been necessary to emphasize vigorously certain fundamental ideas. But these have been sufficiently emphasized and have served their purpose in the process of evolution. But Christ prayed that they all may be one. And this ideal He held up before Him and us as that to which the church would come. The message of the present Church to that of the future is "Get Together."

And again the Church is becoming aware of itself as a world power. Not ours only, but all the nations of the earth are to be taken for Christ. The Church of the future will be missionary in a new and enlarged sense. A returned missionary

recently declared that it even now seemed as if the greatest Church, the most aggressive and potent, in the not far distant future would be, not ours in America, or even in Europe, but the Christian Church in China, in Japan, in India. The nations of the earth are to be taken for Christ, and the Church even now begins to grapple with world problems.

The Church of the present has hardly begun to give, to be liberal, to show vital interest in a whole gospel for a whole world. The Church of the future will be awake to the injunction of our Lord, "Go ye into all the world, and preach my gospel to every creature."

The Church of the future will be the mightiest missionary force that this world ever saw.

For the Church to fulfil our Lord's mission it must be missionary.

A LOOK AHEAD IN SUNDAY-SCHOOL WORK

THE REV. WILLIAM I. LAWRENCE, D. D.

*Secretary of the Department of Religious Education
of the American Unitarian Association*

MY early training in the Christian denomination predisposed me to look toward the future rather than toward the past. The preaching and influence of Dr. Nicholas Summerbell and others of his generation, under whose influence I came, made me feel that Christianity is a progressive religion and must ever take on new forms adapted to the changing conditions in human society.

The changes that have overtaken the world throw upon the Church a new necessity for the preparation of men and women to do their part in society. It is no longer sufficient to secure individual salvation, if, indeed, it ever was. We have come to see that nothing less than social salvation is to be sought, and this through the right development of human lives in morals and in religion. Such development requires more than any spasmodic effort is able to produce, however strong that effort may be. It is therefore necessary that we educate into religious usefulness.

All this means that the Sunday-school is to occupy a very much larger place in the Church of the future than it has done so far. It means, also, that the Church will take the Sunday-school with

a seriousness it has not so far shown. Efforts will be put forth, and made both systematic and earnest, to train workers in the field of religious education. The right guidance of child life is not less important and not less difficult than the right presentation of the gospel in the pulpit. There is every reason, therefore, why the Church should educate its superintendents and teachers with as great solicitude as it now educates its ministers. Whether it will be necessary to make these educational callings professional by giving regular compensation is a matter that time alone can test. Certainly it is true that if such payment to superintendents and teachers is necessary, in order to secure the best, then such payments will not only be justified, they will be provided.

In the choice of superintendents and teachers, character is naturally the first condition. Young people are affected more by example and constant, though unconscious, influences than by direct teaching. No brilliancy of attainment or thoroughness of intellectual preparation for the task will offset lack of character or lack of genuine interest in religion.

Essential as character is, however, it is not enough. Knowledge is also necessary. That there should be knowledge of the Scripture or other material used in teaching is evident to all. What is not so generally perceived is that knowledge of the aptitudes and powers, the abilities and the needs of the various ages taught is also needed. Teachers should be expected to read and teachers' meetings should be devoted to the study of books

on elementary psychology. Every child is a fresh word of God, worthy to be understood, and he is as well an immortal soul whose salvation in the fullest sense requires long continued use of wisely adapted means of spiritual culture. We shall some day be as exacting in our choice and preparation of teachers of religion as we are now in regard to teachers of grammar and arithmetic.

Another feature of the Sunday-school of the future will be an increasing demand that textbooks provided for children shall be prepared by persons who know the subject with which they are dealing and who know the children for whom these books are prepared. In any educational work it is a short-sighted policy to teach as final truth what is already questioned by scholars and is likely soon to be cast aside. Religious progress means the constant elimination of the comparatively crude and incorrect and the substitution for that of the best knowledge of the age. For young people, therefore, who have before them a long period in which they will doubtless progress there should be provided the best and most highly approved manuals of instruction. Our churches have not been careful enough in this regard.

As the Church at large draws constantly nearer the idea of Christian development as being, in the long run, the normal and therefore the safest course, the right guidance of children into the religious life ought to commend itself, and I believe that the Church's policy will be to emphasize more and more the educational aspects of religion.

FUTURE RELIGION

CHARLES W. ELIOT, LL. D.

President Emeritus Harvard University

THE American democracy, which is to a large extent unchurched, manifests a remarkable indifference to many dogmas, formulas, observances, and rites which have had great historic significance in the development of Christianity. The democracy feels no interest whatever in the old dogmas about transubstantiation, predestination, vicarious atonement, or apostolic succession. It takes no side in these discussions, and is incapable of being interested in them. In this respect the mass of young democrats in any Christian country closely resemble the thinking Chinese and Japanese, who find it quite impossible to understand or take any interest in the theological discussions which still seem important to many Christian missionaries in those fields. Dogmas or creeds which have been matters of life and death in Christian lands for centuries seem to the Chinese or Japanese who are thinking of becoming Christians to be matters of no importance and no interest. In like manner a democratic society turns its back on the Christian propaganda which gradually took form in the first five centuries of the Christian era, and then came down from generation to generation without essential change for nearly thirteen centuries more.

The spirit which actuates men of science reinforces the spirit of democracy in modern society. As a rule, men of science have scant respect for tradition or for any authority which is founded on age or acceptance by former generations. They are intensely individualistic, and have little sympathy with the privileged classes or with the traditional or consecrated systems of crystallized or deposited truth. As a rule, men of science have no faith in magic or miracle. They have a passion for truth and fact, but no liking for mere speculation or for theories based solely on men's intuitions. Nevertheless, they are liberal and comprehensive in their ideas of truth and fact; and so they put religion itself, the history of mankind, and the history of language into the region of truth and fact, where men of the most scientific spirit and perfect candor may labor with profit. In this sense the religions of the world are a legitimate field for scientific investigation. Of course, that religion will be most sympathetically explored which seems to the explorer to have been of most service to human society. Men of science also include, among proper fields for scientific investigation, the whole field of man's mental operations, emotions, and passions in regard to their sources, inter-relations, and reciprocal effects. Cautious experimenters, therefore, study with increasing amplitude and success the reactions of mind and body, of mind on mind, and of one will on another will. In other words, science affirms rationality, and believes that man's whole

nature is attuned to the nature of the universe and its God.

In these two prodigious forces—democracy and the spirit of scientific inquiry by the inductive method—there is a common element which is of fundamental importance,—the element of freedom, a freedom which is more than a personal right to think or speak as one pleases. It is the primary condition of existence for both democracy and science and for all their devotees. It is the condition of all scientific and all democratic achievement. It is both the condition and the result of finding the truth. No prophetic utterance can ever be more completely fulfilled than the prophecy, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free," has already been. For four hundred years the real advance of the white race has been towards freedom, freedom of all sorts, in the family, in industries, and in government,—more and more freedom for the child, the woman, and the man; and the two great servants of freedom have been democracy and science. The Christian churches as organized in hierarchies, synods, councils, or convocations, though never a unit in action, have heretofore counted for the most part on the other side; but, since the Protestant Reformation, several Christian churches or denominations have been undergoing a process of evolution which will soon land them frankly and completely on the side of freedom.

So absolute, steadfast, and unstayed has been the march of freedom, civil, religious, and social,

during the past one hundred years, that we may safely infer, concerning the future, that those authorities and forces, old or new, which are inconsistent with essential and disinterested freedom will in long process of time undergo liberal modifications or even cease to be used. There will be from time to time reactions in favor of authority and privilege, but they will surely be temporary and ineffectual. In the same way the influence of trades-unionism and socialism, agencies which cherish democratic ideals and on the whole have furthered the democratic movement in the nineteenth century, may decline in the twentieth, because some of their policies and methods are clearly inconsistent with a rational individualism and an unselfish liberty, and the despotic and oppressive elements in these organizations may come to dominate the liberal. For a like reason monopolies in industries and trade will be successfully resisted, since they cripple free competition and block progress. In like manner those churches will survive which best organize free co-operative good-will for beneficent action in this world. Christianity, renouncing its connection with governments and oligarchic institutions, will become the cordial ally of intelligent democracy and progressive science, and the most effective promoter of freedom, truth, justice, individualism, and human brotherhood. How far society has already come on this road towards liberty we realize when we recall that all the ancient civilizations were founded on human slavery, and that force was in them the one source

of authority. As liberty has increased, the use of force has diminished, until we begin to understand that the force used in the society of the future will be the force which protects ignorance and feebleness, resists evil propensities in individuals or groups, and defends man against adverse nature and his own injurious impulses. Those who delight in force, and in the manly virtues which are often developed in using force, need not fear that the civilization of the future will dispense with force and its hardy virtues. Man's conflict with nature and with his own defects and vices will forever give ample employment for many kinds of protective force, and for human daring, endurance, and self-sacrificing comradeship.

A third doctrine which is fast modifying the religious conceptions of mankind is not new, but newly applied, the doctrine of human brotherhood. Jesus taught it explicitly and implicitly, and the Christian Church has talked a good deal about it, but never put it into effective practice until democracy began to come to its own. It is expressed with wonderful perfection in the following sentence which Lowell quotes from Robinson and Brewster: "We are knit together as a body in a most strict and sacred bond and covenant of the Lord, of the violation of which we make great conscience, and by virtue whereof we hold ourselves strictly tied to all care of each other's good, and of the whole;" but this solemn teaching of Robinson and Brewster did not come to perfect fruition in the Plymouth Colony, and has never

yet been realized in any human society. The past fifty years, however, have witnessed more progress toward the realization of the brotherhood of man than all the preceding centuries of the Christian era. This progress is seen in the wide-spread interest in all the means of improving the moral and physical health of all classes of the community, in the better distribution of the products of faithful industry, in the ethics of all business, large and small, productive and distributive, and in the purpose to give the entire people a sound and effective education. A sympathetic, merciful, and disinterested regard for the less fortunate members of the race, carried into action and affecting politics, government, and industries, has characterized all the progressive peoples in Europe and America during the last fifty years, whatever their form of government, and promises to bring in a new era of peace and good-will. As yet, the Orient has scarcely felt this new impulse towards carrying into practice this sentiment of brotherhood. The many social forces which are working to give effect to this prevailing sentiment are scattered and often not well organized; but they are all benevolent, and they work to one end. The organizations which foster the sentiment of brotherhood have leaders, seers, and prophets, but not rulers. They proceed from the loving emotions of multitudes. They take gradual effect on multitudes, and these effects will tell more and more on the social organization of mankind as time goes on. It is a work which goes forward without haste, without rest, just as we think the work we

call God's goes on. It is, indeed, a part of God's incessant beneficence, a comparatively new part.

These new forces which have so deeply affected the religious conceptions of modern men may seem to tend to take individuality and personality out of our conception of God. They are vast imaginings of omnipresent energy, far removed from the anthropomorphic conception of God as magistrate, enthroned potentate, and God of Battles. It is to be observed, however, that during the period which has witnessed all this progress in science, democracy, and the sense of brotherhood, the regard of mankind for individual persons and mankind's sense of obligation to persons of rare merit have not diminished, but increased. We of to-day recognize our obligations to leading spirits more clearly and comprehensively than our ancestors did. We have quite as strong an admiration as they felt for the prophets, seers, and saints of the past, and quite as strong a gratitude towards our own heroes as they had towards theirs; and we have the advantage of being grateful to many more persons, because universal education enables the passing generation to include great writers of any generation among their benefactors and guides. Human love goes out now as ever to esteemed persons in the family, the state, and the race. The sense of personality, the belief in personality, is an inherent part of our nature, which always has been and always will be, intense and irresistible. Therefore, so long as man is man, God will be thought of as a person, and will have a name significant beyond all other names. Taking

into consideration all the new demonstrations of science with regard to the attributes of God, no name so well describes him as *Our Father* among all those peoples who conceive of a father as the loving head of a family.

None of the advances of science and government have any adverse effect on the conception of Jesus as teacher and exemplar. The sciences have their own prophets, martyrs, and heroes, for whom all worthy scientific men feel profound reverence. Literature and art have their great masters, whose works survive for centuries, and long continue profoundly to influence select human spirits. Jesus, the amazing product of the Hebrew race and of the Hebraic history and tradition, is the supreme teacher of religion, whose teachings, imperfectly transmitted by the groups of simple people to whom he spoke in the language and the atmosphere of an obscure province, and soon corrupted in the great Greek and Roman world, have, nevertheless, proved to be the undying root of all the best in human history since he lived. For this personality the love and reverence of mankind are always ascending and always glowing with greater warmth and brilliancy, as the clouds which gathered out of paganism round his doctrines are gradually dispelled.

The Church of the future will reverence more and more the personality of Jesus, and will dwell on the extraordinary qualities of His teaching, as proved by their historical effects during nineteen centuries. He laid down ethical principles of the purest worth which are good for all time, but

which were so crushed and overborne by the existing currents of thought and the social institutions of his day that they have been struggling for recognition ever since they were uttered, and still lack their intended fruition. To strive patiently towards their just fruition is the mission of the Church of the future.

The future religion will have the attribute of universality and of adaptability to the rapidly increasing stores of knowledge and power over nature acquired by the human race. As the religion of a child is inevitably very different from that of an adult, and must grow up with the child, so the religion of a race whose capacities are rapidly enlarging must be capable of a corresponding development. The religion of any single individual ought to grow up with him all the way from infancy to age; and the same is true of the religion of a race. It is bad for any people to stand still in their governmental conceptions and practices, or in the organization of their industries, or in any of their arts or trades, even the oldest; but it is much worse for a people to stand still in their religious conceptions and practices. Now, the new religion affords an indefinite scope, or range, for progress and development. It rejects all the limitations of family, tribal, or national religion. It is not bound to any dogma, creed, book, or institution. It has the whole world for the field of the loving labors of its disciples; and its fundamental precept of serviceableness admits an infinite variety and range in both time and space. It is very simple, and therefore possesses

an important element of durability. It is the complicated things that get out of order. Its symbols will not relate to sacrifice or dogma; but it will doubtless have symbols, which will represent its love of liberty, truth, and beauty. It will also have social rites and reverent observances; for it will wish to commemorate the good thoughts and deeds which have come down from former generations. It will have its saints; but its canonizations will be based on grounds somewhat new. It will have its heroes; but they must have shown a loving, disinterested, or protective courage. It will have its communions, with the Great Spirit, with the spirits of the departed, and with living fellow men of like minds. Working together will be one of its fundamental ideas,—of men with God, of men with prophets, leaders, and teachers, of men with one another, of men's intelligence with the forces of nature. It will teach only such uses of authority as are necessary to secure the co-operation of several or many people to one end; and the discipline it will advocate will be training in the development of co-operative good-will.

Christian unity has always been longed for by devout believers, but has been sought in impossible ways. Authoritative churches have tried to force everybody within their range to hold the same opinions and unite in the same observances, but they have won only temporary and local successes. As freedom has increased in the world, it has become more and more difficult to enforce even outward conformity; and in countries where Church and state have been separated, a great

diversity of religious opinions and practices has been expressed in different religious organizations, each of which commands the effective devotion of a fraction of the population. Since it is certain that men are steadily gaining more and more freedom in thought, speech, and action, civilized society might as well assume that it will be quite impossible to unite all religiously-minded people through any dogma, creed, ceremony, observance, or ritual. All these are divisive, not uniting, wherever a reasonable freedom exists. The new religion proposes as a basis of unity, first, its doctrine of an immanent and loving God, and secondly, its precept, Be serviceable to fellow men. Already there are many signs in the free countries of the world that different religious denominations can unite in good work to promote human welfare. The support of hospitals, dispensaries, and asylums by persons connected with all sorts of religious denominations, the union of all denominations in carrying on Associated Charities in large cities, the success of the Young Men's Christian Associations, and the numerous efforts to form federations of kindred churches for practical purposes, all testify to the feasibility of extensive co-operation in good works. Again, the new religion cannot create any caste, ecclesiastical class, or exclusive sect founded on a rite. On these grounds it is not unreasonable to imagine that the new religion will prove a unifying influence, and a strong re-inforcement of democracy.

Whether it will prove as efficient to deter men from doing wrong and to encourage them to do

right as the prevailing religions have been, is a question which only experience can answer. In these two respects neither the threats nor the promises of the older religions have been remarkably successful in society at large. The fear of hell has not proved effective to deter men from wrong-doing, and heaven has never yet been described in terms very attractive to the average man or woman. Both are indeed unimaginable. The great geniuses, like Dante and Swedenborg, have produced only fantastic and incredible pictures of either state. The modern man would hardly feel any appreciable loss of motive-power toward good or away from evil if heaven were burnt and hell quenched. The new religion builds on the actual experience of men and women, and of human society as a whole. The motive powers it relies on have been, and are, at work in innumerable human lives; and its beatific visions and its hopes are better grounded than those of traditional religion, and finer,—because free from all selfishness, and from the imagery of governments, courts, social distinctions, and war.

Finally, this twentieth-century religion is not only to be in harmony with the great secular movements of modern society—democracy, individualism, social idealism, the zeal for education, the spirit of research, the modern tendency to welcome the new, the fresh powers of preventive medicine, and the recent advances in business and industrial ethics—but also in essential agreement with the direct, personal teachings of Jesus, as

they are reported in the Gospels. The revelation He gave to mankind thus becomes more wonderful than ever.

RELIGION AND MODERN LIFE

MAKING FOR THE WORLD'S BETTERMENT

THE REV. ALVA MARTIN KERR

Pastor Christian Church, Pleasant Hill, Ohio

THERE is no doubt that some particular phases of the world's life appear to be degenerating, and looking at these one might think that the world is growing worse. But we need to remember that some things must grow worse in order that they may become better, and that it has ever been that the surest way to reform is in the growing aggressiveness of the sin which is to be eradicated. The boldness and viciousness which have always been encouraged in any form of evil that has won a temporary advantage have usually been instrumental in hurrying its ultimate defeat.

But we need to take a broader view and not simply focus our attention on some of the discouraging phases or strata of life. We need to read less the daily newspapers, sewer-sweeps as they are of the world's pollution, and to give more attention to the cleaner periodicals which record the great Christianizing and civilizing achievements and to the good books that keep us in touch with the pure life and the happy homes and the splendid men and women at work in so many ways for the world's betterment. There is ever a serious danger that ministers and reformers, who needs must give much of their time to studying the sin-

sickness of the world, will become so absorbed in their tasks that they will get a lop-sided view of life and think that this old world of ours is simply a hospital for the sick or a pest-house for the filthy! Against every book we read discussing the great evils of life we should place another telling of the goodness of men and women and the certainty of the gospel of Christ; and after every day of service down in the submerged parts we should go out for a walk among the homes where husbands and wives are pure and true, and the little children clean and healthy and happy, and the young men and maidens are dominated by visions of beautiful life and service for God's universe.

The test of civilization is neither at the top nor at the bottom, but in the general average of its life; and it is not by the few things which are growing worse, but by the great forces at work for human improvement, and their progress. The strongest intimations of the world's betterment cannot be put down in figures, but must be sensed as great general movements which are steadily, even if at times almost imperceptibly, reshaping the life of mankind. The progress in these is surely encouraging.

The Church. Quoting statistics to prove that the Church has been gaining or that it has been losing has been a pleasant pastime for many people during the last few years. Both sides have succeeded to their own satisfaction, but both alike have missed the mark. It is not the bigness of the

Church, but its effectiveness, which counts. It is not especially significant whether during any particular period it has increased or decreased in number; but it is vitally important whether it has been growing in scope and vision and in the understanding of its mission. It seems that surely no careful student of the Church now and formerly could doubt that it has made most admirable progress along these lines.

Those who have read religious books too exclusively and histories too seldomly have an exaggerated idea of the purity and piety of the early Christians. Aside from the strictly apostolic days, there has never been a period in the history of Christianity when the Church, taken as a whole, did not permit practices which the Church to-day would absolutely forbid. It is sufficient to remind the intelligent reader of the political machinations of state and Church, of the selling of indulgences, of the persecutions for religious opinions, of the crude and unthinking cruelty, of the gambling and drinking among the clergy as well as membership that carried down to near our own times, and of the denominational bitterness and strife that is just past. Slowly out of these things the Church has found its way to a high standard of excellence. It has substituted for ecclesiastical rightness a new form of higher and more refined righteousness.

Even as significant has been its transformation along another line. In too much of its history it was the instrument of monarchy, and it turned religion and art and literature towards the sup-

pression of the poor. It upheld the divine right of kings and ignored the pitiful poverty of the masses. Its books discussed theological obedience and suppressed the rights of the many. Art covered its walls with marvelous pictures, but none of them tending to relieve the life of the poor. Our Puritan fathers rebelled against art not because they hated the beautiful, but because all of the art that they had ever known upheld an oppressive Church and rulers, or was conducive to lustful imaginations. What great strides we have made away from all of that! The major emphasis of the Church to-day is against the few and for the many, its voice is lifted everywhere in defense of the oppressed, its power coerces governments into justice and equity, its awakened conscience is readjusting the industrial and civic world to a fairer life for the masses it once ignored, the while its benevolence is reaching out to the helpless and distressed everywhere.

Wherever there is something wrong with life, the Church of to-day is beginning to find its mission and its opportunity. Its message of a personal salvation has been enlarged and illuminated by the addition of one also for social righteousness. Its doctrinal creeds over which it used to fight with so much of bitterness are being forgotten, and a new era was indicated when a few years ago there was written the first "social creed of the churches," on which they stand as a unity of thought and purpose for the making of the kingdoms of the world to become in reality the kingdom of our Lord and Christ. And no longer do

the Crusaders of the Church run with butchering swords in their hands to win back the birthplace of Jesus; but with quiet determination and sainted sacrifice they are going into every part of this earth with open Bibles in their hands to teach to every race and clime the significance of the life and death of Jesus Christ.

The Educational System. Second only to the Church in the great work of general uplift are the schools and the wonderful systems of education which are not only the pride of the great Christian nations but are being rapidly imitated, and in some instances almost surpassed, in most of the heathen countries. One needs to recall the poverty of equipment, the brevity of the school term, the crudeness of the teaching which was all too general, the lack of unity, and the common indifference to, if not antagonism against, education only two or three generations ago; and put those things in contrast with our magnificent equipment, our splendid body of instructors, our growing curriculum, the unified thought and purpose, and the whole general tone and standing of our educational system of to-day, to see what marvelous advancement has been made in the last century. The whole thing has been transformed.

The entire spirit and attitude of the masses towards the school and of the school towards the masses has been changed, in large part, throughout the world. Governments have willingly or by force modified their purpose accordingly. They no longer exist simply to live off of the people and

their highest ideal is not now to train their youth for war. They find themselves to be for the general good and that their best-paying achievement is to fit and train their young to live. Their efforts along these lines have been constantly increasing until in our own nation the per capita expenditures for public schools had grown from \$1.75 in 1870 to \$4.76 in 1910. Over against our standing army of less than a hundred thousand men, our nation is maintaining another of nearly twenty-five million children and youth in our schools and colleges of different kinds and its school bill of about \$460,000,000 annually is half again as much as is being spent on its army and navy, and is more than one-fifth of all the annual expenditures of the nation. Illiteracy has decreased during the last ten years, in spite of foreign immigration, from 10.7 per cent. to 7.7 per cent., and this rate is so high only because of the South, running as low as 2.9 per cent. in the West North Central Group of States.

Of perhaps equal importance are the changes which have come in the attempts and purposes of the school system itself. It no longer aims to be merely rudimentary or academic; but through its industrial, domestic, agricultural, commercial, professional, and scientific departments it is giving both the mental and physical training which prepares a youth for efficiency in his chosen vocation. Our high schools are no longer simply preparatory schools for college, but there is an insistent and growing demand that they shall become in even still larger measure preparatory schools

for life. Thus is our school system answering the trend of the times towards the general betterment of the long-neglected life of the common people.

Civic Improvement. The third great force in the life of a people is government, both local and general. It would seem that even the direst pessimist could find ground for hope here. The whole intent and organism of government has been so remodeled since the writing of the Magna Charta that there can scarce be any comparison between it now and in that day. The centuries of slow and sometimes unsteady evolution since then have made possible most remarkable progress in these later times.

The first and most striking thing of all is the manner in which the great human note has been sounded in every part of government in all of its relations to industry and society. From the great indistinct armies of peasants and laborers and artizans and soldiers all at once "Man" has emerged. He stands clear and distinct, a figure of commanding importance. The nations have looked and seen as never before in all of their history the value of a human being. And to-day that worth must be reckoned with in every phase of industry and government and society as it never before has been since Jesus Christ first taught that a man is worth more than the whole world and that all things must be conformed to his essential good. That idea is fast becoming the dominant one of the age, and he must be ignorant indeed who does not realize its significance and he must be blind

indeed who does not see it beginning to work its leaven into every human relationship.

It is transforming the very function of government. Sanitary provisions for the health of the people, pure food laws, the regulation of working hours and conditions, child labor laws, industrial control by courts and commissions, old-age and mothers' pensions, temperance, and a host of other kindred restrictive measures,—these are the things with which governments of to-day are largely occupied. And yet only a generation or two ago most of those matters were thought to be outside of the province and authority of the State. A new literature has sprung into existence covering every phase of human relationship and the duty of the Church and government thereto, and press and platform and pulpit have taken them up and pushed them so hard against the heart and conscience that they have become a part of our every-day thought and mold our conception of Christian activity and ethics; and yet most of these ideas and ideals are things of which our great-grandfathers had scarce dreamed. Even our very language has found it necessary to coin new words and terms to fit the new modes of thought and action. Brotherhood, conservancy, profit-sharing, employer's liability, the rights of the public, safety first, the common good,—all of these in their modern meaning are terms new to our vocabulary, and the fact that they are now playing such a large part in our religious and secular thinking is of tremendous significance as indicating the direction in which we are traveling.

More progress has been made along these new lines during the last half-century than in all the history of the world before. The first child-labor law was passed in the United States by Massachusetts in 1836, and others were slow to follow; but now nearly every State in the Union has some sort of legislation along these lines, and these laws are being modified for the better almost every year. In 1912 our nation established the Children's Bureau, which is a promise of untold fulness for the future. Similar advancement is being made with reference to the protection of both women and men employees, and the humanitarian reforms which are being worked into our industrial age is a wonder of our times second only to the magnitude of our industries themselves.

Reforms in the treatment of the unfortunate are no less marked. The care of the sick and the blind and the insane, organized charities for the poor, the immediate and abundant relief in every case of public calamity, as we know such relief measures to-day, did not exist in those good old times for which some folks long. Prison reform and the science of penology are just as modern; the first adult probation began with Massachusetts in 1875, but now it is in use in some form or other in twenty-seven States, and juvenile probation in still more; there are four prisons in the United States just for women alone; the indeterminate sentence is a recent contribution, and juvenile courts and corrections are almost as new; while the change in the spirit and purpose of it all far outweighs any readjustment of methods. But of

still greater importance than the treatment of these unfortunates are the strides that have been made in public sanitation to keep people from being sick and the lines of prevention to keep them from becoming paupers or criminals or insane. And the thousands of men and women who are interested in these and other reforms, the lives that are being spent as well as the millions of dollars that people are giving and the governments are contributing to push them, is a Christian phenomenon that would have dazzled the apostolic church itself.

The temperance campaign, the one biggest fight against organized evil in this or any other age, has made remarkable achievements in the last quarter of a century. Prohibition carried in five States last year, making fourteen in all, and the total "dry" territory is now more than two-thirds of the area of the United States and includes at least half of the population. Alcohol in Europe is recently faring not much better. Russia and France have given it a mighty blow, and the armies of all of the great nations now at war have placed the ban upon it as an evil altogether dangerous in such a crisis. And Colonel Goethals has just issued an order (November, 1914) requiring total abstinence of a certain class of employees in the Canal Zone. But of even greater importance in the fight than these things which can be measured by statistics is the entrance into it during the last four or five years of several of the great periodicals of national and international influence and of a large number of men who are already

famous as leaders in the affairs of our Nation. This hastens the day when it shall become a real national issue; and once that is done, the end has come.

All of these things and many kindred ones have become the main function of government. Its one-time chief occupation, war, is now only an incidental thing. Perhaps there is no one more telling indication of how far we have traveled away from those "good old days" when nation warred against nation without conscience or hesitation than the fact that in our present world war every nation is trying to shift the responsibility for its beginning on to other shoulders than its own.

The new activities of governments have been brought about by a change in the objective of government itself. Nations are no longer owned by the ruling class and run accordingly, but the people feel that the government belongs to them and they make it and its officers serve their own purpose. In order that it may be more mobile to their will, monarchy is being pushed aside by democracy and the ruling authority is being brought nearer to the people. The right of franchise is ever more and more carefully guarded and its scope extended. The initiative and referendum has been since 1898 adopted in some form in seventeen States, and the recall in a number. The confusing bigness of such tickets as those fourteen feet long in the New York City primaries in 1912 and eight feet three inches long last year in Omaha is being eliminated by the short ballot idea, and the bane of partyism may to some extent

be overcome by the advent of the non-partisan ballot. Woman's suffrage was accepted in two States last year, which makes it a total of twelve. Up to April, 1913, the commission form of government was in use by two hundred and eighty-nine towns and villages, since which several others have adopted it, including three large cities, Dayton and Springfield, Ohio—in both of which the manager plan is in successful operation—and Buffalo, New York. Direct primaries are becoming universal, and corrupt practice acts are yearly growing more rigid and sweeping in an endeavor to guard the purity and sanctity of the franchise, while the Federal law of 1907, prohibiting all corporations from assisting candidates or making contributors for campaign purposes, was but the forerunner of laws requiring the publicity of expenditures, the limitations of the amount which may be spent and other restrictions; and more than three-fourths of all our States now have some such provisions. Not only has the ownership of government been transferred to the people and the spirit and object of legislation been transformed, but the instruments through which they work are being also constantly perfected.

Thus human progress makes its way, painfully, slowly forward.

THE NEW CHIVALRY

THE REV. WILBUR F. CRAFTS, PH. D.
*Superintendent International Reform Bureau,
Washington, D. C.*

DO you know that the deaths of males in this country every year exceed those of females by more than a hundred thousand? And do you know that in childhood more females die than males, and that the tables turn at the age when young men commonly begin to drink and debauch themselves? And do you know that while we have cut down by twenty-five per cent. the total deaths of persons, the Americans above forty years of age are dying faster than ever before—most of this excess being due to the breakdown of the great vital organs in men—the kidneys, liver, heart, lungs, and brain? This physical breakdown is accompanied by a corresponding moral breakdown, for it is moral degeneracy in men and nations that brings physical degeneracy, as science is now proving more conclusively than ever before.

Males are not only filling more of their share of the graves, but, what is worse, more than their share of the insane wards and prison cells.

To save men from premature death and worse dishonor, and to draw to the churches men who allow their moral natures no help from religion,

we should catch these men young, we should save them as boys.

And here we are confronted by the fact that home and church and Sunday-school and public school are all coming far short of their duty in the most important work assigned to them, to *develop a right character in the young.*

Late figures from the United States Bureau of Education show that the "school population" of our country, that is, the number between five and eighteen years of age, is twenty-five millions, and that five millions of these are not in public or private schools. Here comes in the tragedy of child labor, which is killing body and soul, and the equally serious tragedy of truancy. Of those who enter public schools only seven in a hundred complete the course, and only two in a hundred get a college diploma. The instability which this record proves both in parents and in children is itself a sign of moral weakness, and the meager education of the majority leaves thousands open to the perils of a mind not sufficiently developed for high and pure enjoyment. The public school teachers, in a majority of places, I find as I travel about, are not teaching the required temperance lessons effectually, and so are missing the best opportunity to save boys from what Andrew Carnegie says is the greatest menace to their success.

The Sunday-schools, according to the report of the International Sunday-school Association for 1912, have only thirteen millions on their rolls who are under twenty years of age, whereas

there are twenty-three millions outside, of whom more than thirteen millions are old enough to attend; that is the Sunday-schools of all kinds, Protestant and Catholic, reach less than half the children and youth from five to twenty. The Presbyterian Sunday-school leaders are ringing a fire-bell to awake their city churches by showing that in eleven of the largest cities of the land in thirty-two years past there has been an average increase of but *seven per cent.* yearly for the Presbyterian Sunday-schools—in about half of those cities it is an actual decrease off against rapidly increasing population. Dr. C. F. Aked stated, while in New York, that all additions to American Baptist churches for a generation past are only one-fourth of the birth-rate of its own families.

And that brings us to the heart of the blame, the average "Christian home" which is not Christian, which has neither family altar nor family pew, and throws on the Sunday-school, with its half-hour of lesson time a week, the responsibility for the character building of its youth. So far as getting boys to church is concerned, the way to do it has been shown as plainly as the channel from the sea to New York City, and there is no excuse for the tragic folly one sees at the exit of most of our Sunday-schools every Sunday morning—the whole school *turning its back on the church*. The Sunday-school should be marched into the church galleries, and then given a part in the service, especially something in the sermon adapted to interest and help. This has been done and can be

done again. But pastors must study childhood and especially adolescent boyhood to make this a full success. I made it go in my last year as a pastor in New York, and there is instruction also in the fact that in my Brooklyn church of an earlier time I won many boys to Christ by kicking football with them on Mondays in the big church yard.

So far as moral training of boys is concerned, the best work now done is that of the Boy Secretaries of the Young Men's Christian Association, mostly new to the work as yet, with much to learn, but diligently studying real boys and the many excellent new books about boys. The Y. M. C. A. makes real progress in saving boys through men and older boys. The International Secretary of the Y. M. C. A. Work for Boys, Mr. C. C. Robinson, finds the best teachers for boys of twelve to fourteen are older boys from sixteen to nineteen, since that is the altruistic period when boys will get the best self-culture by working for others.

Statistics gathered a few years ago showed that this period of full adolescence is the most favorable time to make an abiding start in Christian life. And yet to-day the three and a half millions of boys at that period of dawning manhood have mostly graduated from our Sunday-schools into the street for lack of manly teachers and hedges of men's classes between them and the door. There are a few of this age in the Sunday evening services, chiefly to see girl friends home but very few indeed at morning church or in Sunday-school. But alas! they are numerous

in the barrooms and where worse debauchery blights manhood. As chairman of a committee on "Safeguarding Adolescent Youth Against Moral Perils of the Community," appointed by the International Sunday-school Association (on which such men as Judge Ben. B. Lindsey and Anthony Comstock also serve), I have made inquiries by a "Questionnaire" all over the United States and Canada of Sunday-school superintendents and pastors and boy secretaries and a few physicians, asking for facts personally known, not rumors, and I have conclusive evidence that not only solitary vice but the social evil begins in many lives of boys and girls at six or seven. I made special inquiry as to the widespread rumors about immorality in high schools and while it was insisted by many, and correctly, I think, that there is not more, but probably less of immorality in high schools than among an equal number of adolescent boys and girls mingling in shops or on the streets, there were so many positive statements of immorality, in several cases involving large groups of high school students, that I feel sure there ought to be additional effort made to safeguard our youth in this period of great temptation.

The first thing to do is to bring to bear twentieth century motives. In the eighteenth century and two-thirds of the nineteenth, fear of hell, that is of future consequences of sin, was probably the strongest incentive to right living. There was usually an effort to repent on death-beds, if not before. A dangerously sick man, even though a

saint, much more if unsaintly, was quite as much in a hurry to see the preacher as to see the doctor. That motive no longer grips even those who profess to believe in hell. I believe in hell just as Jesus believed in it. I make no pretense of being kinder or wiser than Jesus Christ. The courts of this world certainly do not accomplish justice, and the ultimate triumph of justice is an essential of a God-made world. Hell is the supreme court where all wrong judgments and awards of this world are righted. If there is no hell, there is no God, for hell means ultimate justice. But we cannot soon, if ever, restore the wholesome fear of hell to re-enforce conscience in the hours of temptation. We are living at a time when the rewards and punishments of this world are much more considered.

We must appeal to the intelligent self-love of youth. We must prove to boys and young men that vice is the foe of health and efficiency; that it keeps a man from getting a good job and makes him liable to lose it if he gets it; that the vicious will lag in athletics, in scholarship, in business success, in public esteem; that the young man who drinks moderately at twenty will cut out of his life the thirteen best years, as insurance tests of fifty years prove; that every one who sins against purity is on the straight road to all the near hell of the "red plague." Show boys and young men that bad morals are bad manners, bad hygiene, success-killers, joy-killers, man-killers.

On this "Be good to yourself" argument, which is in harmony with the Second Great Command-

ment, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as *thyself*," lays the higher part of the appeal, "Remember the other fellow—Do a good turn to some one every day." The Y. M. C. A. and Boy Scouts find the altruistic adolescent boy responsive to this appeal to help somebody.

Then we are ready for the third story up of the *new appeal* to boys and young men—the *call for a new and true chivalry, loyal, like the chivalry of King Arthur's Round Table, to womanhood and the cross*. When the departure of the Roman legions from Britain, as Tennyson tells us, left men to do about as they pleased in the absence of any adequate government, the roads were filled with robbery, and everywhere outside of walled towns men generally adopted the robber's

simple plan

That they should take who have the power
And they should keep who can.

Therefore King Arthur gathered men of noble instincts about his Round Table and made them Knights, to go forth, not to conquer territory, or markets, or win spoils, but to redress wrongs, to defend the weak, and especially womanhood, in the spirit of the cross. The new science is giving deeper meaning than ever before to the words of Sir Galahad:

My strength is as the strength of ten
Because my heart is pure.

I believe the wrongs which some young men do and which comrades hide on a false sense of

honor can be overthrown by developing a nobler self-government sentiment among young men, a new chivalry that will rule out as "bad form," as dishonorable, the foul story and fouler seduction, the mean tricks in athletics and in examinations, and give us once more "Knights without fear and without reproach," who will take King Arthur's oath, as expressed by Lord Tennyson:

To ride abroad redressing human wrongs
To speak no slander, no, nor listen to it,
To honor his own word as if his God's,
To lead sweet lives in purest chastity,
To love one maiden only, cleave to her
And worship her by years of noble deeds.

THE SPIRIT OF LENT AND LIBERAL CHRISTIANITY

THE REV. JOSEPH FORT NEWTON, LITT. D.
*Pastor Liberal Christian Church (Universalist),
Cedar Rapids, Iowa*

L ENT is the meditative season of the Christian year, when the thought of all lovers of Christ looks forward to the Passion Week, and its commemoration of the Great Sacrifice. As men realize once more that their hope is rooted in divine suffering, a certain instinct in them recoils from self-indulgence. For that is what Lent implies and involves, if it be taken seriously and in a mood befitting its solemnity and beauty.

No doubt to the sleek and modern man, with his worship of comfort, it may seem absurd that any mortal should forego a dinner for the sake of his soul. To me, even in its crudest and most material aspect, it is eloquent of the fact that man does not live by bread alone. Surely any man, to whom the Garden of Gethsemane is more sacred than the garden of Epicurus, must be arrested by the spectacle of millions of his fellows setting themselves to face, even for a brief time, the duty of self-denial. Admit that Lenten forms often obscure the idea they seek to embody, and that merit is too easily attached to means rather than ends, it is none the less impressive.

Abstinence, as such, may have little value, but that it may be put to high uses no one will deny. Lent may at least remind us that Christ does call us to something far higher and nobler than physical ease.

What a shame, cried St. Bernard, to be a delicate member of the Head crowned with thorns. Habitual temperance is more religious and more wholesome than recurrent austerities, but we have not attained to that grace. Normally, no doubt, the conditions most favorable to holiness result from the healthy interaction of body and soul, but life in our age is not normal. It is sodden with materialism. We may rightly reject the ascetic theory as a mistaken dualism, but there is another side to that truth. Nor must we forget that some of the loftiest and loveliest souls this earth has known used strange, stern means as helps to the holy life. A call for a week of self-denial in Paris not long ago was accompanied by an extract from a letter by Wilfred Monon, running thus:

How is it that Protestants have produced, on a man like Pere Graty, the impression which he formulates as follows: "Protestantism is, in essence, the abolition of sacrifice. To abolish abstinence and fasting; to abolish the necessity of good works, effort, struggle, virtue; to shut up sacrifice in Jesus alone and not let it pass to us; no more to say, as St. Paul did, I fill up what is wanting in the sufferings of Christ, but rather to say to Jesus on His Cross, Suffer alone, O Lord—there is Protestantism."

Of course, sacrifice means more than doing without food, and it is going too far to say that

Protestantism abolishes good works, effort, virtue; but the latter part of the statement is only too true. Both in theory and practice we have shut up sacrifice in Jesus alone, holding that the merit of his suffering is imputed to us without our sharing his suffering. Not so St. Paul, whose passion it was to be a partaker of the fellowship of the sufferings of Christ, if so that he might win the high prize of the life eternal. St. Bernard, not less than Wesley, taught the goodly gospel of free grace, but he did not feel that it exempted him from a habit of austere living. Nor did Wesley. Neither of those masters of the spiritual life neglected the stern culture of the soul, as so many of us are wont to do, under the notion that the virtues are gifts and not trophies. Pere Graty was right in pointing this out as a grave defect in our teaching, and even more so in our practice, of the religious life.

If this is true of Protestantism in general, it is still more true of that wing of it, which calls itself, not always truly, the Liberal Church. Here, at least, I may be permitted to speak frankly and to the point, applying my words more severely to myself than to any other. If I allow myself to be called a liberal Christian, it is not because I like defining my Christianity by an adjective—for I do not. But I somehow got the idea that this movement meant that a man is free to be a Christian, not that he holds his Christianity, loosely, if not lightly. It had come to me that a liberal is one who has the same charity toward the past as

toward the present, and is as willing to listen to St. Bernard as to Henri Bergson.

At any rate, it had been told me that the liberal pulpit rejected certain dogmas about Christ, and I thought that was because it wanted Christ brought nearer to us—with a demand that I knew would plague me with an unsatisfiable passion to be more like Him. Some of us thought it was discontented with doctrines of the atonement, because it wanted the reality—that we are called to be crucified with Christ, that he may rise in us. We thought it held a gospel of salvation which bids a man stand naked before that Awful Holiness, seeking “purity rather than peace,” as Newman made him to do. Were we mistaken? If so, then Liberalism shall know me no longer, for who teaches an easy gospel teaches a gospel of perdition, whose end is death. So help me God, those who come here seeking any such doctrine will not find it!

This is true, whatever else be false—that following Christ is a great adventure, and it means that we must take up a cross and bear it. Much as we may admire modern life, with many of the ideals of this indulgent age, there can be no compromise, if we are to be followers of the Master. What fills me with deep disquiet about our Christianity to-day, both liberal and orthodox, is that it is so harmless. Even if we apply it to social questions, as we talk so much of doing, there will be little result unless it has more power in it than it has now. It behooves us to bethink ourselves of these things, as we look toward the passion of Him

who, being rich, became poor, and was a friend of the lowly and forlorn. Lent evokes such thoughts, and it is therefore that we should keep it and wisely use it.

For one thing, Lent brings up the whole question as to the relation of the life of the body to the life of the spirit. Such a question cannot be discussed here at length, but it is a far-reaching one and may be hinted at. It is good common sense, as well as Platonic philosophy, that he who devotes himself to his appetites will have thoughts wingless and alien to the sky. Think of fasting how you will, "a stuffed body cannot see clearly," as the old axiom assures us. Much less can it see those invisible things which ask for close and deep thinking. Asceticism, in its true sense, is simply a disciplined effort to gain an end, nothing more. Every man, if he has any ideal of any sort, is more or less an ascetic whether he knows it or not. That is he begins, if he be wise, by cutting off what is incompatible with attainment. Thus an athlete goes into training, and by renunciation, by obeying rigid rules, makes his muscles strong and his nerves firm. Thus a man of affairs foregoes many pleasures to win the prize he aims at. Lent is a period of training for the soul, in behalf of a deeper insight, a fearless self-examination, and a better ordered life.

As such it is not beyond the reach of the most flaccid of us, since neither our bodies nor our wills are as finely tempered instruments as they ought to be. Henry James urged men to keep alive in them "the faculty of effort," by doing each day

something for no other reason than that they would rather not do it. "By such renunciations," he said, "we attain a twofold end: we strengthen a habit of self-control, and we prepare ourselves to stand when the hour of dire need draws near, lest it find us unnerved and untrained to stand the test." Certain it is that a man inured to habits of concentrated attention, energetic volition, and self-denial will be unshaken while his softer fellows fall. "A good will is the substance of all perfection," said the author of "The Cloud of Unknowing;" and he added,

Silence is not God, nor speaking; fasting is not God, nor eating; loneliness, nor company; nor yet any of all the other two such contraries. He is hidden between them, and may be found only by love of thine heart. He may not be found by reason, nor concluded by understanding; but He may be loved and chosen by the true loving will. Such a blind shot with the sharp dart of longing love may never miss the mark, the which is God. Look that nothing live in the working mind but a naked intent stretching into the Divine.

For another thing, Lent suggests most eloquently the need and culture of some definite method for the culture of the inner life. Here is the great defect of our age. No wonder so few of us ever get beyond the native and instinctive religion which is an endowment, and cannot be shaken off. In other things we have method, system, discipline. No lawyer tries to practice at haphazard, with no regard for the decisions of courts or the masters of the law. Yet that is what we do in our life of faith. Not many of us know even the names of the great religious masterpieces—those pas-

tures of the soul, so rich in beauty and wisdom. What a treasure of insight and experience, what noble companionship, what high leadership—and yet it is left unused. Volumes could not tell the folly of this neglect. The wonder is not that we have misgivings, but that we have any faith at all, so little care do we take to keep it alive in our hearts.

Here again let me speak frankly, not to hurt, but, if it may be, to help. Some of us, women for the most part, take up with the cult of the New Thought, or of some other sort, and spend some time each day reading its books. That is a start in the right direction—but such books, mere rubbish and hodge-podge, bereft of beauty, devoid of insight, with never a glint of genius! Suppose one should study art in that manner. Suppose one should leave out of account Angelo, Rembrandt, and Raphael, and take up with some poor dauber. That would not be more pathetic than what some restless troubled minds are doing. They have never employed method in studying the great Christian religion, but must follow some wandering marshlight. What a spectacle! If any one wishes an inspiring optimism, radiant and serene, let him go to Emerson, who had authentic genius and power. Better still, let him devote the hours wasted on poor scribblers to the Book that shows us, as in a mirror, what we are and what we ought to be.

Then, too, Lent asks us to look into our own hearts and face what we find there, though it may make us shudder. One of our comfortable essay-

ists said the other day that people in our days are not troubling about their sins. That is only too true; and it might be very well but for the fact that their sins will never cease to trouble them. With that terrible intensity of insight Ibsen has made us see that sin, no matter how it is excused or hidden, troubles not only ourselves but those yet unborn. If a great outside teacher, who can hardly be said to have had any faith in God, drives this fact home to men, surely the pulpit is remiss when it does not emphasize it. There were with us only a few years ago two such teachers of the very first order, Ibsen and Tolstoi. Now they are both gone, and there is no other who comes within sight of them.

Whatever else may be said of Ibsen, he was one of the greatest rulers and interpreters of the human spirit. So long as men dare to see life as it is, he will be read. He tore away ruthlessly the masks and veils with which men hide the fact of sin in the heart, and made us view with uncovered eyes the uncovered horror. He showed the insecurity and ultimate impossibility of any life that is founded upon a lie. It cannot stand. It is a house built upon the sand. Further, this stern teacher goes down into the dim depths of the soul and finds that sin exists there, and that while men spend much time in cloaking it, it never can finally be hidden. What a tonic he is, after reading the rose-water theology of our day, which either ignores sin, or seeks to disinfect it with an easy-going optimism.

Not so Ibsen. He preaches sin as a terrific reality, and he knows the agony of its inner wound, but alas! he has no hope that it can be cleansed away. Confession he knows, but not the music of the gospel fact of forgiveness and healing. He preaches as few have ever preached the truth—

Could my zeal no respite know,
 Could my tears forever flow,
 All for sin could not atone—

and there he stops. He sees no hope save in death, and that is why in six of his ten plays men and women invoke death by their own hands. Like all really profound thinkers, he saw the great fact of sacrifice, and especially the free sacrifice of the innocent for the guilty. Yet, sadly enough, he did not see the meaning of the Great Sacrifice, and so finish the lines—

Thou must save, and Thou alone.

When the thoughts of men are turned toward the Cross, let us look into our hearts in the light of the life and sacrifice of Jesus. God of mercy! What vile and slimy things a man finds in his heart, when he sees it as it is, in that soft, sure, penetrating Light! He sees all that Ibsen saw, and more too. How his respectability vanishes. How his towering vanity comes tumbling down into the dust. Yet it is a kindly light, not only pure, but purifying, with health and healing in its rays. It shows a great horror, but it gives us a great hope. Once a year, at the least, a man should examine the house of his heart and see

what kind of spirit lives there—and that is the meaning of Lent. It demands that we fling away the spectacles of pretense, and face our souls in the light.

Such a meeting with his own soul is good for a man. It helps him to see things as they really are—himself included, if so he may bestir himself to be other and better than he is. More than all, it induces a true humility of spirit, which is the beginning of wisdom and of righteousness. With me, the question is how to live before death so as to be worthy to live after it. Often it is a matter of grave doubt with me whether it is worth while to continue the experiment of such a life as mine. Until it is nobler and more Christ-like than it is, that doubt must remain at once a perplexity and provocation to effort.

It is good to be last, not first,
Pending the present distress;
It is good to hunger and thirst,
So it be for righteousness.

It is good to spend and be spent,
It is good to watch and to pray;
Life and Death make a goodly Lent
So it lead to Easter Day.

THE HYMN

THE REV. JENKIN LLOYD JONES, LL. D.

Editor "Unity," Chicago

THE hymn reaches its climax in Protestantism. The Catholic Church has given us a few great hymns that have come down through the ages and have become the common property of Christendom. These are the great asset of all churches. It is true, however, that the hymns of the Catholic Church are largely chants and are entrusted to priestly hands; congregational singing, as an element of power, is scarcely known within the gates of the Roman or Greek churches. It is Protestantism that has put religion into the vernacular of the common people and taught them to sing together the praises of God and the brotherhood of man. Democracy has been served by the inspiration of congregational singing. This is why we come upon the paradox revealed in all hymn-books, namely, that the singers have been the liberal men of their day, the open-minded men. Freer America has immeasurably enriched the hymn and tune books of Europe to-day.

In the hymn we find a great and valuable kind of literature, a high expression of poetry, and a unifying and reconciling interpretation of religion. In the hymn we find a great bond of

fellowship, a democratic power which overcomes many of the obstacles to unity that now seem insuperable.

There is a little book prepared for use in Sunday-schools in England—they do much more serious work along such lines there than we do here—by my friend, V. D. Davis, called “Twelve Hymns and Their Writers.” It contains an attractive sketch of the author in each instance and such interpretative matter as will enable an intelligent teacher to take a bright class of boys and girls, say from the sixth grade up, through a delightful course of hymn study. These twelve hymns have been selected for their great power, determined by two tests, their literary merit discovered by analysis, and their synthetic success as revealed in the experience of mankind.

The first hymn is from the great master of poetry, John Milton. It represents the inspirations of untrained childhood, being the product of a fifteen-year-old boy in an attempt to render into meter the great Hebrew Psalm, number CXXXVI.

Let us, with a gladsome mind,
Praise the Lord, for He is kind,
For His mercies aye endure,
Ever faithful, ever sure.

This hymn, the editor tells us, is found in the hymn-books of all creeds in England.

Milton was a radical, more of a Unitarian than a Trinitarian. His hymn is equally well known and revered by both.

The author of the second hymn, Bishop Ken,

was a conservative royalist, who took the side of the king in the great confusion that followed Cromwell's time:

Awake, my soul, and with the sun
Thy daily stage of duty run,

a great morning hymn, which, if you have been well reared, you ought to know and love.

Next to this conservative Episcopalian we find the great "come outer" and Protestant, Isaac Watts:

Our God, our help in ages past.

Then comes Charles Wesley, the sweet singer of Methodism, with his great hymn of consecration:

God of Jesus! hear me now,
Take the meek disciple's vow;
Thou so good, so true, so kind,
Fill me with His holy mind.

I hope some of you are able to complete the hymn out of your memories without further reading.

Next we find the gentlest, most pathetic child of English poets, poor dear William Cowper, haunted with great misgivings, burdened with great sensitiveness of soul, driven at times by his conscience clear over the line of sanity. During one of his periods of retirement he wrote this profound hymn which touches the deep places in your life and mine. It was a sick soul's effort to avoid the temptations to suicide:

God moves in a mysterious way
His wonders to perform;
He plants His footsteps in the sea,
And rides upon the storm.



Deep in unfathomable mines
Of never-failing skill,
He treasures up His bright designs,
And works His sovereign will.

Ye fearful saints, fresh courage take;
The clouds ye so much dread
Are big with mercy, and shall break
In blessings on your head.

Judge not the Lord by feeble sense,
But trust Him for His grace;
Behind a frowning providence
He hides a smiling face.

His purposes will ripen fast,
Unfolding every hour;
The bud may have a bitter taste,
But sweet will be the flower.

And here is the great stanza that must have helped thousands of other preachers in their intellectual perplexities as it has helped me:

Blind unbelief is sure to err,
And scan His works in vain;
God is His own interpreter,
And He will make it plain.

The next hymn comes from the great French "social worker," as we would call him to-day, the man who anticipated all the settlements, and antedated John Ruskin and Arnold Toynbee—Jean Frederic Oberlin, lover of the poor:

O Lord! Thy heavenly grace impart,
And fix my frail, inconstant heart;
Henceforth my chief desire shall be
To dedicate myself to Thee.

From Oberlin, the devout French social worker, we come to John Johns, the head for many years of a large democratic mission in Liverpool, a

devoted Unitarian worker for and with the poor.
He sings:

Come, kingdom of our God,
Sweet reign of light and love!
Shed peace and hope and joy abroad,
And wisdom from above.

Three times does our author, in selecting the twelve great hymns for English school children, cross the sea. Samuel Longfellow gives his—

O life that maketh all things new,
The blooming earth, the thoughts of men,
Our pilgrim feet, wet with Thy dew,
In gladness hither turn again.

Alice Cary offers her—

True worth is in being, not seeming,—
In doing each day that goes by
Some little good—not in dreaming
Of great things to do by and by.
For whatever men say in blindness,
And in spite of the fancies of youth,
There's nothing so kingly as kindness,
And nothing so royal as truth.

There are two more stanzas of that infectious kind. The thing sings itself. I am reminded in reading these hymns of my own oft-repeated saying that there are other things that are catching besides smallpox and measles.

The third American hymn comes from the Quaker poet, Whittier:

Who calls Thy glorious service hard,
Who deem it not its own reward.

Mr. Davis closes the collection with the classic Christmas carol of the nineteenth century, which could not be kept out of any adequate

hymn-book. An omission of it would be a culpable violation of the demands of culture as well as religion :

Ring out, wild bells, to the wild sky,
The flying cloud, the frosty light;
The year is dying in the night;
Ring out, wild bells, and let him die.

Ring out the old, ring in the new,
Ring, happy bells, across the snow;
The year is going, let him go;
Ring out the false, ring in the true.

Ring out a slowly dying cause,
And ancient forms of party strife,
Ring in the nobler modes of life,
With sweeter manners, purer laws.

Ring out false pride in place and blood,
The civic slander and the spite;
Ring in the love of truth and right,
Ring in the common love of good.

Ring out old shapes of foul disease;
Ring out the narrowing lust of gold;
Ring out the thousand wars of old,
Ring in the thousand years of peace.

Ring in the valiant man and free,
The larger heart and kindlier hand;
Ring out the darkness of the land,
Ring in the Christ that is to be.

I have another little book I would like to tell you about. An old friend of mine, Nicholas Smith, a hard working editor, was chorister in a neighboring Methodist church while I preached in Janesville, forty years ago. In later years he fell on weariness and sickness, but he helped himself out of the world cheerfully and sweetly by compiling the "Songs From the Hearts of Women." Here are two hundred songs gathered from the pens

of fifty-five women authors. Eight of them, or over fourteen per cent., are well-known Unitarian women, but when congregations sing these hymns they do not sing Unitarianism, they sing the *unity* that is the root word of Unitarianism, and which is conquering the world. Here are the old familiars, the dear ones! I stop only to mention some of those you will most promptly recognize.

Perhaps the greatest thing ever achieved in America in the way of a hymn by man or woman is Julia Ward Howe's "Battle Hymn of the Republic," born out of the inspiration of a sleepless night and a turbulent time. The story is here told at some length of Sarah Flower Adams, a sensitive, frail woman, the author of "Nearer, My God, to Thee." She was a playmate of Robert Browning, though some seven years his senior, and she waited for the rising of his star. She was a member of the congregation of William J. Fox, an eminent radical preacher of his day. This hymn was born out of the needs of his London congregation, which was too radical to be tolerated even by many of his Unitarian neighbors. And yet here is the hymn of this radical singer published in all hymn-books, probably the most popular sacred song of the nineteenth century. Said I not well that in the hymn we find the bond of democracy and the interpretation of religion that outreaches all creeds? These fifty-five different authors reach from Madame Guyon of the Catholic Church down to the radical Unitarian author of "Nearer, My God, to Thee."

Among these hymns we come upon—

Take my life and let it be
Consecrated, Lord, to Thee.
Take my moments and my days,
Let them flow in ceaseless praise.

Take my hands and let them move
At the impulse of Thy love.
Take my feet and let them be
Swift and beautiful for Thee.

by Frances Havergal. In her forty years of life she enriched the hymn-books of England and America. Twenty-five of her hymns have found, Mr. Smith says, a permanent place in all hymn-books.

Here is the Welsh Anna Waring, who gave us "In Heavenly Love Abiding," and this other one we love to sing,

Father, I know that all my life is portioned out for me.

And here is one from Eliza Scudder, kinswoman of Horace Scudder, for many years editor of the *Atlantic Monthly*:

Thou Grace Divine, encircling all,
A shoreless, boundless sea,
Wherein at last our souls must fall;
O love of God most free!

Helen Maria Williams was English born and French reared; her life was entangled in the most stormy times of France, but she escaped from the fever of hate and conflict and gave us out of her Unitarian heart one of the noblest contributions to any hymn-book:

While Thee I seek, protecting power!
Be my vain wishes stilled;

And may this consecrated hour
With better hopes be filled.

Thy love the power of thought bestowed,
To Thee my thoughts would soar;
Thy mercies o'er my life have flowed;
That mercy I adore.

* * * * *

When gladness wings my favored hour,
Thy love my thoughts shall fill;
Resigned, when storms of sorrow lower,
My soul shall meet Thy will.

My lifted eye, without a tear,
The gathering storm shall see;
My steadfast heart shall know no fear—
That heart will rest on Thee.

“Nearer, My God, to Thee,” is the fitting climax of this rich collection of poetry offered by the women of Protestantism. Women may have failed in winning a permanent place among the dramatists of the world—I can think of no great epic from the pen of a woman—but one might think of a hundred great hymns from the pens of women which would easily establish them in the aristocracy of brains, the select circle of the noble and the gifted comfort givers, consolers, peacemakers of the world. They belong to a blessed hierarchy.

Here is another little book I wish you all possessed. My own copy is much marked and criss-crossed. It was compiled by the tireless, and now that he has gone, we know, the sainted W. T. Stead. That great ocean steamer which sank with its freight of culture, refinement, wealth, and influence took with it to the bottom of the sea no life more generous, more consecrated to higher

things, more intimate with the sanctities of life than that of William T. Stead. Between the cracks of a marvelously busy life he compiled this charming little book of "Hymns That Have Helped." Not selected by his own judgment alone, but by a wide correspondence, soliciting the votes of men and women whom England and America honor. This collection reaches from that great hymn of the Roman Catholic Church, called the greatest Christian hymn ever written, the "Dies Irae," "The Day of Wrath," which Goethe and Sir Walter Scott translated, and which is said to have been worked into a hundred and sixty different English translations and ninety different German translations. Archbishop Trench said of it, "It holds a foremost place among the masterpieces of sacred song." This mighty hymn borrows the majesty of the Old Testament, singing it into the somber but sublime conceptions of the Catholic Church. Study it, not for its theology, but for its sublime imagery. Here is from one translation:

That day of wrath, that dreadful day,
When heaven and earth shall pass away,
What power shall be the sinner's stay?
How shall he meet that dreadful day?

Another translation:

Day of wrath! O day of mourning!
See fulfilled the prophet's warning!
Heaven and earth in ashes burning.
O what fear man's bosom rendeth!
When from heaven the Judge descendeth,
On whose sentence all dependeth.

We come down the cycle of these "Hymns That Have Helped" through a charming range of

poetry, finding abundant testimony to the claim that the hymn is oftentimes a great contribution to literature. If I could give but one illustration of the hymn as literature, I would offer John Stuart Blackie's

Angels Holy, High and Lowly.

of which Richard A. Armstrong, an eminent Unitarian minister of Liverpool, says, "For many years I always asked my congregation to sing this hymn on the first Sunday after my vacation, which I generally spend in the hills and mountains of Scotland or Norway." Mark the mighty grasp of the facts of science, geology, astronomy, in earth and sea and sky revealed in this great hymn of nature:

Angels holy,
High and lowly,
Sing the praises of the Lord!
Earth and sky, all living nature,
Man, the stamp of Thy Creator.
Praise ye, praise ye, God the Lord.

* * * * *

Sun and moon bright,
Night and moonlight,
Starry temples azure-floored;
Cloud and rain, and wild winds' madness,
Sons of God that shout for gladness,
Praise ye, praise ye, God the Lord!

Rolling river,
Praise Him ever,
From the mountain's deep vein poured;
Silver fountain, clearly gushing,
Troubled torrent, madly rushing,
Praise ye, praise ye, God the Lord!

Bond and free man,
Land and seaman,
Earth, with peoples widely stored,

Wanderer lone o'er prairies ample,
Full-voiced choir, in costly temple,
Praise ye, praise ye, God the Lord!

This is good poetry, it is good science, as well as high religious feeling.

I want to give you the catch lines of some of the hymns which are now in your pews, and I trust in your homes. Longfellow represents our thought of the Church in his—

One Holy Church of God Appears.

Chadwick's words have brought consolation to thousands:

It singeth low in every heart,
We hear it each and all—
A song of those who answer not,
However we may call;
They throng the silence of the breast;
We see them as of yore,—
The kind, the brave, the true, the sweet,
Who walk with us no more.

All of us love to sing Gannett's words:

Bring, O morn, thy music!
Night, thy starlit silence!

We have poetry and creed, theology and philosophy all bound together in Hosmer's splendid hymn:

One thought I have, my ample creed,
So deep it is and broad,
And equal to my every need,—
It is the thought of God.

And here is Whittier's great hymn among many great hymns:

I long for household voices gone,
For vanished smiles I long;

But God hath led my dear ones on
And He can do no wrong.

I know not what the future hath
Of marvel and surprise,
Assured alone that death and life
His mercy underlies.

* * * * *

I know not where His islands lift
Their fronded palms in air;
I only know I cannot drift
Beyond His love and care.

And so beside the Silent Sea
I wait the muffled oar;
No harm from Him can come to me
On ocean or on shore.

I know not how to close. How these hymns
reach down into life's profound! Not alone in the
Catholic Newman's "Lead, Kindly Light," or
Blackie's "Hymn of Nature," but in Charles
Wesley's tender—

Love divine, all love excelling.

and Walford's—

Sweet hour of prayer! Sweet hour of prayer!
That calls me from a world of care,
And bids me at my Father's throne,
Make all my wants and wishes known.

In seasons of distress and grief
My soul has often found relief,
And oft escaped the tempter's snare
By thy return, sweet hour of prayer!

The hard lines between Trinitarian and Uni-
tarian which led John Calvin to burn Servetus and
brought a procession of martyrs, are reconciled
and overlooked in the great hymn of Sir John

Bowring, the Unitarian, which the orthodox churches have been glad to appropriate:

In the cross of Christ I glory,
Towering o'er the wrecks of time;
All the light of sacred story
Gathers round its head sublime.

Sankey was the most orthodox of singers, yet Bradlaugh, the great Radical, wanted all the Socialists and Secularists to sing at their meetings his hymn

Work for the night is coming!

But a hymn is only half a hymn when read. The hymn is a full hymn only when wedded to successful music, and any student of hymns must always recall the great triumphs of the tune maker. I am sorry for those of you who have a prejudice against the hymn-book, all hymn-books, because they are so deeply enmeshed in certain ecclesiastical forms and myths that you have discarded. Believe me, the hymn-book is a great source of culture, a mighty depository of inspiration. The Sunday service, if it does nothing else than invite you to sing together a few of these great classics of the Spirit, does much for you. The time will come when you will look back and count these hymn treasures among the precious assets of your spirit.

Let us learn to sing together that we may better work together. Let us find communion in the great psalm makers, that we may find our place

more fittingly among the great workers, doers,
and helpers of the world.

*Sweeten us, Father, with the holy songs of Zion,
which teach love, which consecrate lives, and are
dedicated to virtue. Amen.*

THE RELIGIOUS USES OF THE IMAGINATION

THE REV. WILLARD L. SPERRY, PH. D.

Minister Central Congregational Church, Boston

WE have it on Paul's authority that a Christian should be "all things to all men." Most of us have difficulty with this program and our difficulty is not temperamental but moral. For even if we had the pliability of nature which would enable us to be all things to all men, we would still doubt whether we ought to be all things to all men. The process savors too much of the morals of the Jesuit, who holds that the end justifies the means. And as we read human history the world is saved not by the supple methods of the Jesuits with their morals of expediency, but by the uncompromising attitude of those rugged souls who dare to be themselves. "I have set my face like a flint," said Isaiah. "Here I stand, God help me, I can do nought else," said Luther. In the long run these flinty natures get the world farther ahead than do the pliable natures. They are a hard people to have dealings with; in their friction with others they strike off the hot sparks of controversy, but nevertheless, the friction of these flinty natures with their world generates the energy by which the world is lighted and warmed and moved forward.

Never, apparently, was the pliable nature so superfluous, never was the uncompromising nature so necessary as to-day. The gravest charge which we can bring against any of our contemporaries is that we do not know where to find him on the religious, the economic, the political problems of the times. There are already enough of us mentally and morally at sea, the baffling winds of doctrine are blowing us hither and thither, and people to-day are always watching for some great rock of a man like Luther, under whose lee they may come to anchor. To be all things to all men in this distracted and self-contradictory time, is to be nothing to anybody.

For the man who really wishes to help save the world must know where he stands on the troubled issues of his times and having found a standing place he must fix himself there before he begins reaching out a helping hand to his distressed contemporaries. Phillips Brooks used to tell candidates for ordination into the ministry that they must never let their desire to be helpful make them false to the Truth, for there come many occasions when a man cannot be immediately useful and perfectly honest. To tell the truth as we see it, so far from being always helpful to others is often hurtful to them. Many and many a prophet and reformer has had to undermine his immediate usefulness by the exercise of his sincerity.

And any man who sets out to help save the world must make his choice between these two distinct ideals of conduct, that of immediate use-

fulness, and that of immediate honesty. There are those who truly believe that the supreme moral obligation is that of an expedient helpfulness. Their ethic compels them to trim their sails to the prevailing winds. They go with the crowd that they may serve the crowd. They turn themselves into something they are not, becoming all things to all men if by all means they save some.

But over against these utilitarian moralists are those to whom this effort to become somebody other than oneself is morally repulsive. Their ethic demands a fundamental consistency of life, at whatever expense to one's usefulness. Now the modern world increasingly demands of politicians and propagandists and preachers that they shall abstain from playing different roles under different circumstances and that there shall always be a direct correspondence between what they are and what they do and say. The extremity of contemporary society is such that it cannot be deceived and cannot be saved by play-acting. The would-be prophet whose passion for helpfulness leads him to become a kind of spiritual chameleon, taking the color of his office from his immediate environment, cannot hope to save his fellow men. If we give way to the seductive temptation to be helpful at whatever cost to our personal integrity, if in the desire to be always useful we become

Heedless of far gain
Greedy for quick returns of profit, sure
Bad is our bargain.

It is against this bad bargain, the easy bargain of a sentimental utilitarianism, that the idealist must fortify himself. To be all things to all men is to be greedy for quick returns of profit and heedless of far gain. And it is the far gain accruing to the Truth that should be dear to honest men.

We need, then, to-day above most of the days that have been beforetime, those fixed and solid persons who have achieved some measure of private convictions for themselves, and who have the courage to stand by their convictions believing that whether the crowd hear or whether they forbear, yet shall they know that there hath been a prophet among them. To be all things to all men in the modern world is to be false to all men. "To thine own self be true and it must follow as the night the day thou canst not then be false to any man." This is a hackneyed platitude only to the man whose experience has not elevated it to the dignity of spiritual law.

And, as a matter of fact, Paul who wrote these words about becoming all things to all men, was not literally all things to all men, as the phrase is commonly interpreted. Like all rugged prophets he was from first to last true to himself. After his conversion he did not become a Jew again that he might save the Jews, he remained an uncompromising Christian. He did not become a pagan that he might save pagans, but cherished an unremitting hostility to the degeneracy of paganism. In the face of Jews and Gentiles he dared to be himself at all times, whatever the consequences.

In all justice to the man, then, his words cannot be wrenched from their context, but must be interpreted in the light of his life as a whole.

It would seem that Paul takes it for granted that he and those to whom he addresses himself had learned this first lesson of the religious life, the keeping of faith with oneself, and were ready for a further lesson. The problem is, having a personal conviction, how to most effectually transmit it to others. And Paul seems to be saying, that in order to do this well, a man must be able to get far enough outside himself to understand the position of other men. In homely paraphrase he is saying, After I became certain of my own Christianity, I then made an effort to see how this Christianity of mine would look to a Jew, so that I could better help the Jew. I tried to see how the idea of religious liberty would look to people who are still bound by religious authority. I even tried to see how all religion must look to irreligious people, that I might approach them more successfully. I was not content to make my stand on my own private position and preach that flatly and dogmatically, I tried also to put myself in the other man's place, that appreciating his needs and difficulties I might know better how to get at him. I was not for a moment unfaithful to myself, but I did desire a better understanding of other men's lives, and broader sympathy with them. Being all things to all men, is not with me a practice of expediency but an exercise of sympathy and of imagination.

So interpreted, the words come to all of us with a direct imperative. For there is one great outstanding deficiency in our modern life, it is the deficiency of imagination. We belong to a practical generation which has sworn its fealty to matters of fact. A hundred years ago Wordsworth insisted that it was the office of the imagination to see into the heart of common things, to discern the vitality and value of otherwise dead facts. That office can be neither superseded nor relinquished. The crying need of this hour is not for more facts about God and man, but for more imagination to appreciate and appropriate to our very selves the facts we already have.

So the modern man goes to work upon the findings of geology and astronomy and history, and his imagination brings God to life for him. He goes to work upon the findings of sociology, he looks over the wilderness of facts about wages and dividends and poverty and child labor and occupational disease, and lo, in the text books and government reports there are very many facts and they are very dry, but his imagination breathes into them the breath of life and fact is joined to its fact and they are clothed with flesh and stand upon their feet a multitude of men and women and children, his brothers.

We have prided ourselves in America that we have no classes here—that all men are free and equal in the consistent texture of our Democracy. It is now a vain pride. For better or for worse we must face the present matter of fact, the advent of class distinctions, the rise of class con-

sciousness, the collision of class interests. And the great need of our time is for those of sympathetic imagination who have the power to get outside of themselves to put themselves in the place of the members of another class. There has been much said in the last decade about the questions at issue between the capitalistic and the laboring classes, but no word truer than this, "The broken link between classes in the modern world is the underlying defect of imagination. People who consume more wealth than they ever produce, discuss in their drawing rooms, and over their exquisitely spread and served tables, what *ought* to be, until one would say that social effort is the modern substitute for common honesty. Dives inspects and investigates Lazarus, but never so does he find out what it feels like to be Lazarus, and Lazarus' point of view." We sit comfortably down in our seats at a concert, and we flatter ourselves that we have an ear for music, but what we do not hear, because we have no imagination, is "the still sad music of humanity." We know that here, as everywhere in the world the debit accounts of poverty and want fill the ledgers of society, the facts are perfectly familiar to any tolerably well-informed person, but because we are relatively comfortable and wholly unimaginative we do not feel "the sorrow barricaded evermore within the walls of cities."

On the front page of *The Survey*, that excellent magazine devoted to social betterment, there appeared a few years ago a little picture illustrating a homely, familiar, matter of fact. The fact

would probably have left people as it found them, indifferent, had not some seer, with a flash of imagination lit up the whole scene with a single sentence from Scripture, as a flash of lightning lights up in dazzling, unforgettable brilliance some naked landscape. It was a picture of a few children sleeping on a winter night in a bleak, barren hallway. Some of them were half naked, having no shelter from the cold, and others were wrapped in bits of tattered horse blankets and old carpets. And there they lay, happily unconscious for the moment of their world of troubles, pinched, stunted, pathetic, and ghastly white, part of the unfit by-product of the ongrinding of society, the scrap heap of humanity. And under the picture were these words, "For so He giveth His beloved sleep." Ah, the irony of these words, that rapier thrust at the vitals of our comfortable religion, that blow in the face of our unimaginative contentment.

It is no longer enough to busy yourself with the good works of charitable condescension, to draw generous checks for our favorite philanthropy. The social problem cannot be solved by paternalism. And modern religion is driving men beyond the unimaginative offices of organized charity deeper into the somber relatives of human life. Toward his later end John Woolman, the old West Jersey Quaker, fell into a grievous illness, and as he says in his journal, "I was brought near to the gates of death. Being then desirous to know who I was I saw a mass of matter of a dull gloomy color between the south and the east and was

informed that this mass was human beings in as great misery as they could be and live, and that I was mixed with them, and that henceforth I might not consider myself a distinct and separate being." This is the strange and sobering experience through which the prophets of our own time have been passing—they have seen this mass of matter of a dull gloomy color, the sodden areas of humanity and they have known in their own souls that they are personally identified with this somber reality and that from henceforth they may not consider themselves as separate or distinct beings.

And the real crux of all so-called social problems lies right here—whether or not the one-half has the power of the imagination to realize the life of the other half. One is sometimes inclined to think, that at this juncture it would be better, far better for society, if we abandoned all our philanthropies and closed up all our settlement houses and adjourned all frantic committee meetings *sine die* and went into our closets and brooded in solitude over the sad facts which we already have at our disposal until by a sympathetic imagination we had raised them to life. That is what made Tolstoi the power that he was and is. He came to realize in mid life that he was a party to everything that was happening in Russia. He contemplated the serfdom, the poverty, the disease, the militarism, the exiles, the executions, the sorrows of his country and through the Pathetic Symphony of his nation's life he heard the one single insistent theme, "For me, for me all these things are happening." Not until this same

monotonous theme sounds for us also, through the still sad music of humanity, can we properly and profitably approach the social questions that trouble our contemporary peace.

It is commonly mooted among us that the laboring man does not understand the responsibilities and difficulties which the capitalist faces in carrying the heavy responsibility of the business world. He does not appreciate the risks and perplexities of large operations. This statement is undoubtedly true. An unimaginative labor is no better than unimaginative capital. But that is labor's concern. What concerns us, who by circumstances belong to the so-called middle and upper classes, is that we shall actually realize the lives of those to whom the lines have not fallen in pleasant places, that we be able to understand the emotions, the aims of the man whose livelihood comes a few dollars at a time in a pay envelope, that we shall appreciate the stern struggle for economic existence in the competitive labor market. That we shall really see how life is going to look to hundreds and thousands of men during hard times who will ask in vain for man's first right, the right to work. We are in no position to discuss these troubled questions, until by imagination we have raised familiar facts from the dead and made them alive for ourselves.

And what must be true of our political and economic efforts in religion must be true of our directly spiritual efforts. It is at once the strength and weakness of Romanism that it professes to be all things to all men, it is strength in that it

has a certain fine catholicity of mind, its weakness in that it does not encourage the private struggle after intimate and personal conviction. The weakness of Catholicism has been Protestantism's opportunity, for Protestantism is the religious sanction of the individual's effort to achieve his own private spiritual certainties. But his strength will also be his weakness, unless to the fidelity of his private religious realities every Protestant adds the power of imagination by which he and his fellow Protestants shall appreciate the position, the difficulties, the needs of other men. Unimaginative Protestantism means selfishness and bigotry. The ideal Church would be a Church which had first hammered out its own particular corporate certainties and then, by the deliberate exercise of the religious imagination had been able to get outside itself and understand the point of view of other religions and no religion.

The modern church ought to be located in the midst of the confused issues of contemporary life, standing somewhere along the boundary between classes, at the point where social issues meet, depending upon its very life and growth upon the vigor of its imagination. All the comfortable counsels of expediency to the contrary, there is much to be said from the religious point of view, if not from the narrowly ecclesiastical point of view, for having our churches where we have our offices, our factories, our theaters, and our libraries and colleges. The most vicious theory now entertained by religion is that for which the suburban church unconsciously stands, that relig-

ion is primarily concerned with private and domestic life and has nothing to do with the large issues at stake in society as a whole. Hoffding, the great contemporary philosopher of religion, says that formerly religion was the pillar of cloud by day and fire by night which marched in the vanguard of history, but now it is only an ambulance corps trailing along in the rear of the conflict, caring for the sick and wounded. Probably the ecclesiastical institution which prefers as its location, the safe glad rear of society to the dreadful van can knit more socks for the victims of society's civil warfare than the institution which is on the firing line, but the latter institution has at least the compensating consciousness of being on the field of action, where the fortunes of war are being determined. And the plain fact is that whatever may be the need of ecclesiasticism, the need of religion is much greater for the moment, in offices and factories and universities, than is the assured sanctities of sheltered homes.

The one great opportunity open to the modern Church is that of the mediator. The world is riddled with bitter and baseless misunderstandings. There is no institution which ought to be so effective in helping men to understand one another, as the church. The first office of the church which is not unhappily, but happily located where there are all sorts and conditions of men, is to help those men to see eye to eye. Such a church ought to break up the ice of class consciousness with the warmth of its spirit of common worship. It ought to get people out of their

narrow ruts and into the highways of human concern. It ought to be in its temper and mind a clearing-house for all the different points of view in the modern world. It ought to be a place where men who are naturally strangers to one another, become friends.

Every church, then, must by a definite exercise of sympathy and imagination visualize its community and its constituency. It must actually enter into the physical and spiritual conditions of those whom it professes to serve. It must be alert to the stupefying power of too many comforts, it must taste the gall and wormwood that are left at the bottom of all aimless pleasure seeking. It must sense that moment of opportunity when world weariness may be deepened into divine discontent, when the Church can rise up in conscious integrity and can say for all to whom life has been too easy and too comfortable, "O God, Thou hast made us for Thyself and our hearts are restless until they find rest in Thee."

And a Church must also realize the conditions which prevail at the other end of the world. "In listening to these people," said Balzac of the characters whom he created by his imagination, "I could espouse their life. I felt their rags upon my back; I walked with their feet in their tattered shoes; their desires, their wants, everything passed into my soul and my soul passed into theirs." That is being all things to all men. That is the way a church must live and work. It must realize the grinding monotony of modern industry. It must feel what it is to work long hours

and days and weeks and years without cessation in offices and shops and factories. It must realize how remote all talk of the bread of heaven is to those who want their daily bread. It must realize what it is to live a whole lifetime never more than a few dollars removed from naked need. It must vicariously experience the terrible loneliness of detached individuals in great cities. It must sense hall bedrooms as well as homes. It must appreciate the insidious temptations of solitude. It must espouse the physical and spiritual extremities of defenseless and defeated humanity.

There has probably been no man in the modern world truer to himself, more faithful to the rugged individual consciousness of the solitary prophet than Tolstoi. But likewise, because he disciplined and developed his power of sympathetic imagination, there is no one of the moderns who has come so near being all things to all men, as he. It was Tolstoi, the intense religious individualist, who wrote the words of that great Pilgrim's Song, which has been so nobly wedded to Tschaikowsky's music:

My blessing fall on this fair world,
On mountain, valley, forest, ocean,
The clarion winds in ceaseless motion,
And heaven's blue banner high unfurled
And bless the staff that hither bore me,
And alms that helped me on my way,
The boundless plain that lies before me
The glowing morn, the evening grey.
The very path by which I wander
Shows glorious, golden bathed in light,

No blade of grass that glistens yonder
But seems a star in heaven's height.

O might I in my exultation
To all the world this joy impart,
Would I might clasp the whole creation,
Lovers or strangers, foes or brothers,
Would I might clasp them, the whole creation,
In fervent rapture to my heart.



THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH AND WAR

THE REV. CHARLES E. JEFFERSON, D. D.

*Pastor Broadway Tabernacle Church
New York City*

CHRISTIANITY is a world religion. It carries the weight of the world on its shoulders and the horizon of the world in its eyes. It is a Good Shepherd religion, and its heart has no rest so long as a solitary sheep is out of the fold. As it goes on its way it picks up, one after another, the continents, the big ones and the little ones, and seeks diligently for all the islands of the sea. It wants to whisper something to them. It wants to tell them God is love.

From the nature of Christianity the Christian church becomes an international institution. Her field is the world. You never see the Church at her best unless she is playing a part on a stage as wide as the planet. She never gives indubitable evidence of her divine origin until she sets to work at an immeasurable and impossible task. When you see her working in a limited field, petty in spirit and narrow in aim, pottering about things which are paltry, you wonder if this is the institution which was to come, or whether the world had better look for another. But when you see her laying her hands on the brows of nations, pouring fresh vigor in the brains of empires that

were old when Jesus died on the cross, laying hold of backward and friendless races, and planting their feet on the steep and difficult ascent, up which the leaders of humanity are making their way, there is borne in upon you the conviction that this is none other than the servant of the Most High God, and that her commission was written in heaven.

The Christian Church is irrevocably committed to the cause of peace. Her commission runs after this fashion: "Go, disciple the nations"—put the nations all to school, "baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," into the character of the God of love, "teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I command you:" for instance, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." "Love one another even as I have loved you." "One is your Master, and all ye are brethren." "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the sons of God." "Love your enemies, pray for them that persecute you." "Put up your sword." "When you pray, say, Our Father." The work of the Church is to tie up the continents and the islands, the kingdoms and empires and republics in these two heavenly teachings, the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. Wherever she goes she proclaims that "God hath made of one all the nations of the earth to dwell together," and that "Christ has broken down the middle wall of partition."

All these things are written in a book. A Christian is a man of a book. He never goes any-

where without this book. This book has two chapters: the first chapter contains a picture of a bonfire in which the boots of war and the garments rolled in blood are being consumed to ashes, and in the light of that fire we catch glimpses of a world in which all the instruments of slaughter have been transformed into implements of the feeding and nourishing of mankind. The second chapter of the book contains simply the portrait of a man, a man whom all the world has come to call the "Prince of Peace." Under the portrait an old tradition is written to the effect that on the night on which this man was born the skies became musical with voices of good-will. The story of the book is a loving heaven, and the mission of the book is to make a loving earth.

Wherever the Church goes she carries in her hand a sacrament, the sacrament of the bread and the wine. The bread and the wine symbolize the broken body and the poured out blood of the "Prince of Peace." And wherever the sacrament is administered, the Church keeps repeating the words of Jesus: "Unless you eat my flesh and drink my blood, you have no life in you." The "Prince of Peace" lives in and works through His followers.

The Church carries but one banner, and upon that banner there is inscribed but one figure—the figure of the cross. The cross is the symbol of tenderness and compassion, of brotherliness and self-sacrificing love. If a Christian at home or abroad ever loses the temper of conciliation, or ever forgets the vocabulary of good-will, or ever

comes to think that force is mightier after all in the solution of world problems than love, he forgets what spirit he is of.

The first great Christian missionary always considered himself a peacemaker. Paul lived in a world that bowed low before the god of war. Wherever he went he saw fortresses and citadels, forts and fortifications. The language of the camp and the barracks was always in his ears. The whole world seemed to have been made for the soldier. These magnificent Roman roads running out from the banks of the Tiber to the ends of the earth, had all been thrown up by Roman genius and paid for with Roman gold for the use of the Roman legionaries. All the triumphal arches had been built by conquering generals, and the long lines of marble statues imaged the faces of men who had soaked the earth with blood.

But out of this world filled with military sights and sounds and memories, there came to this missionary a beautiful vision, a vision of a new army, a new commander, and a new cause, and a new triumph. Paul saw that he himself was a soldier and that all his fellow Christians were comrades in a great campaign. He said to himself: "These roads have been created for the use of us Christian soldiers and we will march along them to the ends of the earth, not in the boots of war, but in the sandals of peace. We will pull down the strongholds, but the weapons of our warfare are not carnal. We will lead nations into captivity, but they shall be captives of the Lord of Love." And as a great vision of a mighty army loyal to

Jesus of Nazareth breaks upon him he cries out to men everywhere: "Put on the whole armor of God, fasten your belt, adjust your breastplate, put on your helmet, take up your shield, grasp your sword—let us endure hardness as good soldiers of Christ."

The picture of the missionary in the first century is a good picture of a missionary in the twentieth, for the world still lies in bondage to the god of war, Christendom bristles with guns. After each of The Hague conferences all armaments were increased. This is because Christendom is in the hands of the militarists, and for a generation they have worked their will.

It is idle to talk of the observance of conventions and treaties so long as nations rely on their armies and navies for the accomplishment of their purpose. Italy stole Tripoli because she had an army. Austria stole Bosnia because she had an army. Armies enable nations to steal. Navies combined with armies make it easier still. No wonder the House of Commons laughed at Germany's promise not to keep any of Belgium at the end of the war.

Conscience atrophies under armorplate. European diplomacy has been frightfully debauched and degraded by the frenzied piling up of guns.

Men are not likely to rely on reason when they have at their elbow a mass of steel on which they can lean. They are not inclined to wait patiently for the slow processes of diplomacy, when they can do things much quicker with the sword. The notion that nations can be trusted to keep their

word, are more certain to work for the higher interests of mankind when they expend a large part of their revenues on instruments of destruction has vanished into air.

Europe is now uttering a solemn warning to America. The old world is speaking to the new. Ancient monarchies are offering counsel to our young Republic.

For a generation we have been aping Europe. The ideal of Washington and the other founders of our nation has been fading from our eyes. To not a few Germany has become a model. We have adopted many of the old world customs.

We have a Navy League, and we launch our dreadnoughts with the playing of bands, and the hurrahs of high state officials.

We have our swelling naval budgets, and our niggardly appropriations for the causes of social betterment, after European fashion.

We have squandered millions of dollars on fortifications in the Philippines and other millions in Hawaii, and we are about to squander other millions in Panama.

We have spent in a few years over two billion dollars on our navy, and this is but a trifle compared with what we are going to spend, if the navy oligarchy, intrenched in Washington city, has its way.

We have learned to talk glibly about naval tonnage, and naval prestige, and to admire fourteen-inch guns, and to publish pictures of battleships even in religious papers. They do it that way in Europe.

And now Europe, being in torment, calls to us: "O Republic of the West, do not follow my example! There are ways which seem right to a nation, but they lead down at last to the chambers of death. Do not believe the creed which we have long accepted. Armaments are not guarantees of peace. They are not insurance. They are not instruments of reason or righteousness. They create first suspicion, then hatred, and at last lead young men by the million to the fields of blood. Do not choose the path which we have followed. Work out your destiny along a different line. Make the new world different from the old. Banish the implements of hate from your eyes. Turn your minds off the machinery of slaughter. Cease to delight in the engines of destruction. Trust in reason. Have faith in brotherhood. Believe in love. Build your civilization on the principle of good-will. Bind all the nations of the Western Hemisphere into a federation which, by its fidelity to the law of kindness and its devotion to the Prince of Peace, shall become at once the inspiration and hope of the world."



COMMENTS ON RELIGION AND MEDICINE

FENNER A. CHACE, M. D.

Dermatologist Union Hospital

Fall River, Massachusetts

IT is often held that religion is concerned with the so-called spiritual nature of man, and that medicine is concerned with the so-called physical nature of man. Just what this means, I do not know. The materialist on the one hand, claims that all his matter, that both so-called spiritual, and the so-called physical manifestations of life are simply phenomena of matter, while the Christian Scientist and others claim that there is no such thing as matter, that all is spiritual, and that which seems material is simply a delusion of mortal mind. Most men seem to hold views between these two extremes.

For my own part, I am unable to divide man up into the spiritual and physical, or as it is sometimes put, into the moral, mental, and physical. For what we term the moral, mental, and physical, are so dependent on one another that I cannot separate them one from another.

To illustrate, a physician is called to see a boy who is stupid, disobedient, dishonest, cruel, morbid. The parents are in despair, fearing that their boy may become a criminal. The clergyman, the parents, and sympathizing friends have done their best to reform the boy, but all in vain. The

physician makes a careful examination, and finds that the boy is suffering from adenoids, an abnormal overgrowth in the naso-pharynx. The growth is properly removed by the surgeon, and the patient becomes a bright, obedient, honest, kindly-disposed, happy boy. This illustrates the influence of what we term the physical on what we term the mental and moral nature.

Again, a patient is suffering with what is popularly termed nervous prostration. He seems to be a physical wreck of humanity. He is a dyspeptic, has distressing headaches, and pains in various parts of the body, is emaciated, despondent, miserable. The family physician and various specialists have failed to relieve him of his malady. Finally it happens that he adopts Christian Science, or comes under the influence of a clergyman working in the Emmanuel Movement, or visits a holy shrine which he believes in, or invests a small fortune in a quack medicine, worthless in itself, which he believes is curing him, or falls in love, or takes a beautiful sea-voyage, which inspires him with the beauties of nature and makes him forget himself, and as a result of one or another of these experiences, he is made whole. He can eat with pleasure again, his headaches and pains have disappeared, he gains in weight, and goes on his way rejoicing. This illustrates the influence of what we term the mental on what we term the physical nature of man.

Again, a patient has rather suddenly become irritable and nervous, is troubled with insomnia and indigestion, has disagreeable sensations as if

his stomach was turning over and his throat was spasmodically closing and then relaxing, cannot concentrate his attention on his work, fears he will have to give up his job, etc. His physician tells him he is all tired out and must take a vacation. He goes into the country and steadily grows worse. While there, he consults an old-fashioned country physician, who knows more about human nature than about the latest discoveries of medical science, and on cross-questioning him, finds that he is harboring a grudge against an acquaintance who he thinks has wronged him. The good old doctor persuades him to throw aside his petty grievance and forgive his acquaintance. The patient returns to his work and regains his normal health. This shows the influence of what we term the moral on what we term the physical nature.

Again, let us consider the case of a young man who has spent most of his days trying to please himself. He has studied a little philosophy and fancies that he is an atheist. He is blase, has a pessimistic view of life, believes human beings are about as bad things as possible, and life is a farce. A little later in life, he becomes inspired with a desire to help his fellow men, to make himself a useful member of society, and he sets about his task. Gradually he finds himself becoming more and more interested in life. The more he knows of his fellow men, the more good he finds in them, and the more sympathy he has with them and with the universe in general. As he continues in his work, he finds that his philosophy of life is

changing. Almost as a shock to himself, he finds that he is believing in a Source from which springs all the good that he finds in his fellow men and in the universe. While he cannot define the Infinite Being any better than he could when he was indulging in his speculative philosophy, he finds that he believes in God. And he becomes more and more impressed with the majesty of the goodness of human life, he finds himself believing that this life does not end all. While he cannot perhaps explain the possibility of the future life any better than he could in his boyhood days, he finds himself believing in Immortality.

This illustrates the influence of what we term the moral on what we term the mental nature of man. The man's theological opinions have been changed through his change from selfish to more unselfish living.

Many more examples drawn from human experience, might be cited to illustrate the interdependence of what we term the spiritual or moral, the mental, and the physical nature of man.

With these considerations in mind, it seems better to me to regard man, here and now, as a unit. In the next life, we may have no need of our bodies, but while we are on earth, we cannot get along without them.

Religion, here and now, is concerned with man, with the whole man. Medicine, here and now, is concerned with man, with the whole man. While the work of the clergyman does and should differ in detail from that of the physician, yet, in a broad sense, at least from my point of view, the

purpose of religion and the purpose of medicine are the same, viz.: to minister to the needs of humanity, to make men healthier, happier, better. The clergyman, who limits his work to philosophizing and preaching on the nature of God and the universe, and the relation of man to God and the universe, but fails to interest himself in the crying need of humanity for relief from sickness, poverty, and misery, has failed, it seems to me, to grasp the meaning of religion. The physician who limits his work to the treatment of diseased conditions, and fails to appreciate that in dealing with his patient, he is face to face with a fellow man, often more in need of a heart-to-heart talk, healthful advice, and encouragement, than of drugs or the knife, may be a skilful operator or an able prescriber, but he is not a whole physician.

A recent writer has said, "The physician must also be a metaphysician." I would add that the clergyman would do well to have an elementary knowledge of human anatomy and physiology.

Of course this view of religion and medicine suggests danger. There is danger of the religious enthusiast without the requisite scientific and medical training, attempting to encroach upon the domain of the trained physician, and danger of the physician attempting to do what the patient's pastor is better equipped to do. But there is danger everywhere. We must trust God and humanity to face these and other dangers and ultimately accomplish a proper adjustment. The fact remains that it is the right and duty of both the clergyman and the physician to be interested in

the whole man and to minister as well as each can to the needs of humanity.

The clergyman is the specialist in dealing with the theory and practice of religion. But religion is not to be confined to the clergy. It is for all. In the prevention and cure of wrong living, and lifting of humanity to high and higher plains of living, the clergyman needs the co-operation of all.

The physician is the specialist in dealing with the theory and practice of medicine, but medical work is not to be confined to the physician. In the work of prevention and cure of disease, the physician needs the co-operation of all. Without the co-operation of the laity, the physician can accomplish little. If he can gain the co-operation of the patient and his friends, much can be accomplished toward the cure of disease. Moreover, I believe it is safe to say that if the physician can gain the thorough co-operation of the public in the prevention of disease, many of the dread diseases now tormenting humanity, like tuberculosis, typhoid fever, scarlet fever, diphtheria, cholera, etc., and some forms of insanity, can be wiped off the face of the earth.

Sometimes it seems to me a mistake to regard religion as a vocation, and to compare it with medicine and other vocations. For religion is practiced in every honorable walk of life. Indeed, every vocation should be a religious vocation. There should be none which is not of service to humanity.

In closing, I would say, whatever be our work and play in life, let us work and play religiously,

endeavoring to make the best of ourselves, and to be of service to our fellow men. Let us all walk together in harmony with God and the universe, to make men healthier, happier, better.

1

2

3

4

THE PECULIAR FUNCTION OF THE FREE
CHRISTIAN CHURCHES OF AMERICA
IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

THE REV. FRANK G. COFFIN, A. M., D. D.
President American Christian Convention
Albany, New York

IT is the broad mission of every generation and institution to gather the best from its predecessors for its own structure, and to make possible the perpetuation of only its best to its successors. To this the Church is no exception. She has had many faults, but that the most of the Church is worthy of perpetuation is unquestioned. Though she has been infused with the divine life, her outer structure has been human, intensely human. This fact gives hope for any state in which she may be found. Things human are changeful, therefore it is always possible to change them. They respond to effort. Righteousness is never an accomplishment, it is always a process. Even the dominion of God is a progressive rule. He is always taking away the first that he may establish the second. His faithful servants have confessed that they forget the things which are behind and press on to the better, unwilling at any point in the process to count themselves to have attained. Nothing better answers to the spirit of modernity than the sense that things are

yet unfinished and the ultimate is not reached. If we presume that all is completed we have no part to play and no satisfactory explanation for our existence. God does not discredit the conscience and ability of any generation by denying it a constructive part in an ever-continuing divine program. Time's measure of efficiency is ability to answer the demands of the day in which one lives. The call for service will always be as insistent and needful for one generation as another.

It is therefore an indictment against this generation if it does not find something to improve. Years have not taught wisdom and vision has not grown.

Therefore in the discussion of this subject the author means no charge of unfaithfulness against those whose work has made necessary a special function for free churches; nor does he imply any criticism not born of kindness and a desire to help. Any mission peculiar to free churches comes to the evolution common to growth and change. Whatever our achievements in our day and generation, they will not excel those of churchmen of the past whose errors we are now seeking to correct, or be actuated by better motives.

Freedom in itself is no virtue. Its credit is in its purpose and manner of use. That we belong to free churches may be largely the result of circumstances. If we are actually liberal in spirit the credit is personal. Freedom has nothing to do with the doctrines held per se; but with the way in which they are held. There are any number of people who are claiming the designation of

liberals because they are anti-orthodox, or semi-orthodox. In spirit they are less free than others. They are not liberal, for they are intolerant and discourteous toward that which is sacred to others of good lives. He is not truly liberal who satirizes the faith of even a Hindu. The real liberal is generous of spirit, never a scorner of other men. He is not an iconoclast, or religious vandal.

Unfortunately liberalism seems to be known and measured most widely by the blatant radical, whose self is the greatest argument against his doctrine. We have all seen teachers of free churches as dogmatic in an anti-orthodox position as the most hide-bound ecclesiastic of the seventeenth century. An incidental reference to personal faith was the signal for their attack of scorn and vituperation. They assumed to censor every person's faith at any time or place. Our generation is being overrun with a horde of illiterate liberals, who have attached bad fame and false meaning to a word which the world would soon be ready to welcome. They credit themselves with advanced opinions, only because they are radical ones. They talk of their new ideas which are only different ideas. Antiquation and foggyism are proven against you from the fact that you disagree with them. Such must not give either spirit or reputation to the modern free church.

Any person who is unsympathetic toward others and their view-point, and intolerant of their thought, can never be regarded as free, no matter what church enrolls his name. He is only an intolerant fanatic for free instead of for conventional

religion. The freedom of which Jesus spoke is freedom within the truth, "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free," and the only kind to which one is entitled in the Kingdom of Christ. He was the "Way, the Truth, and the Life and no man cometh unto the Father but by me." The spirit of His truth controlling the life and the church in Christlike generosity in all things is the mark of the Christian liberal and the free church.

The mission of free churches cannot be less than others. It is not narrowed to doing exclusively the things which others have neglected. Theirs is a work common to all of the forces of the Kingdom plus. They are not to sound a different note for novelty's sake, nor for justification of their existence. Their mission should not be conditioned upon what others do or fail to do. It should arise out of a conviction from walking with God.

The danger which we of the free churches must guard against especially is that the false bases of much of the Christian Church may cause our message to degenerate into one of mere protest, and we become critics of an order of things which does great good despite its regrettable features. Seeing the many intellectual errors, our efforts may be so concentrated upon their correction that our message may seem to be only a new philosophical formula.

In view of the present demands of church creeds, forceful negation has a legitimate place; but mere negation in statement threatens to entrap

the unwary into negation of action. It would be a monstrous thing to conceive, if free churches should so emphasize the need of reform in our present religious order, that they would only make converts in thought of those whom other churches have already converted in conduct to Christ. The greatest message any church can have is that of a Savior for the sin, misery, and redemption of the world. There are parasite churches, who make few converts in character, but recruit their forces from the unsettled and disaffected which they have stirred up in other communions. Insurgent religion is very popular in some localities. Its coming is welcomed because it berates and criticises. Any church, or group of churches, worthy to live will magnify their religion into greater proportions than this.

There is also the temptation to render the spectacular rather than a useful service. To make the bystanding, seldom-cheering crowd cheer a bit. To emphasize differences instead of points of unity. To be different seems courageous. To attack others invites hero-worship. So, every move should be made from a decision of what will be really constructive. In a word, the purpose should be to bring about Christ's ideal of the true Church.

Such a service should not be for just one church, designated as free, but among and within all churches. A true liberal can well afford to surrender the credit for doing a thing, if by that process the thing will be more generally or better done. It is not to be presumed that dogma-controlled forces will come into free churches *en*

masse, and with blare of trumpets proclaim their conversion and advertise their former restrictions broadcast. It will be enough if the principle wins without any change of membership. It is Roman Catholic to insist that all churches come into one, it is a free church spirit to bring all churches into oneness. No spontaneous revolution will answer the call of the free church, with a sudden uprooting of all that has been. A gentle permeating evolution, requiring time to be appreciable will be the response.

However imperatively changes may be required in matters ecclesiastical, we must not take up our task with the feeling that the church at present is effete and worthless. Such an attitude will force aggravating complications into problems already grave. The good that is must not be weakened. Smoking flax is not to be quenched, nor bruised reeds broken, by the Christlike. With all of the ecclesiastical narrowness with which we are confronted, we demand not a new, but a broadened channel of expression.

So, free churches have no individual message in the sense of personal proprietorship. It is a message of the great, all-controlling truth, to which they must as studiously make themselves develop as they would have others. Theirs is not an already fixed state, or realized ideal to which they are inviting the world's partnership. It is the open mind and that complete discipleship with Christ which will lead them on unto perfection.

It is difficult to interpret needs beyond our own immediate days. To but few men is given the

prophetic instinct. The function of the free church as here outlined must be understood to be but my own opinion in the light of present needs and apparent tendencies. I conceive that to the free churches belongs the responsibility in our century of doing the following five things, which are in reality five features of the one great thing.

I. *To remove mental barriers which have kept out truth.*

We have proceeded on the hypothesis that truth is as fixed in quantity as it is in character. Our later thought is that it is cumulative instead. Probably truth in the abstract, as God conceives it, is fixed and final. But our perception of it is an ever enlarging one, or we are living much in vain. Our conception of truth expands as the soul expands, and the soul expands additionally as our conception of truth expands. We know more truth of every kind after years of study and experience. We have had to revamp our theories repeatedly in order to accommodate new concepts. Generations advance into mental largeness. It is inconceivable that this should be true of all departments of life except the religious.

Yet, we have established dogmatic formulae of conceptions of religion, which we have said in effect contain the truth, all of the truth, and only the truth. We have assumed for our creedal statements a sacredness demanding, "You must measure up to them, but you must not go beyond them, under no less penalty than the eternal anger of God." We have built a prison about the soul of man and given him liberty just within the four

walls of it. The imperial idea has established an ecclesiastical government in religion, which is but an attenuated autocracy, copied from the civil rule of the ages in which it arose.

A modern writer has pointed out, "It is a remarkable fact that the very spirit to which Christianity is most hostile, the passion for power, dominion, pomp, and preeminence, struck its deepest roots in the Church." The spirit of charity has been frequently outraged by an opinionated church, which has not only prevented growth, but at times finally extinguished both desire and ability for growth. The natures of both God and man argue that a conception of religion can never be safely created by the ideals of a preceding century. The incomparable themes of religious faith are too vast to be compressed into a few restricted statements for any age. What consummate presumption mere man exercises when he epitomizes deity and abridges the religion of omniscience into a few phrases and says to inquiring minds, "This is all?" A divinely inspired word, which required centuries to bring the thought of God to the pens of men, to be summarized into a half-dozen pages of a modern discipline! The greatest inquiry of the ages settled for all time by a council! Men cannot fix the bounds of truth; it must regulate them. Nor can it ever be humanly known when truth has reached its last word.

A regulating creed, to be so, must assume eternal and infallible rightness. It must be everything as a measure of religious thought, or it is

worth nothing. It must limit progress to the lines covered by it. Those who subscribe to it can be free to find nothing outside of what it has prescribed. The inevitable consequence is arrested progress. Think of it, a man with a mission in the twentieth century trying to accomplish it with tools from the seventeenth—trying to meet the requirements of the present with a thought and method shaped for the past.

New occasions teach new duties; Time makes ancient good uncouth;
 They must upward still, and onward, who would keep abreast of Truth;
 Lo, before us gleam her camp-fires! we ourselves must Pilgrims be,
 Launch our "Mayflower," and steer boldly through the desperate winter sea
 Nor attempt the Future's portal with the Past's blood-rusted key.

If I seem extravagant, divide the portrayal by half and a great mission for free churches still stands revealed. It may be urged that while the preceding seems to be the theory concerning creeds, dogmas, and ecclesiastical control generally; yet in practice they are less restrictive and the churches do not really adhere to them longer. Were this true we are in need of a campaign for common honesty.

Though they are eventually together, truth of spirit is more essential than truth of doctrine. God can enter and rule in a sincere soul, though it be ignorant; but He cannot dominate a mind false to its own perceived truth. Christianity is pre-eminently a life. It is unnatural that theological

opinions should be determinative standards in a test of character. Jesus taught that those who enter the Kingdom are they "that do the will of my Father who is in heaven."

Not all can be delivered from the control of dogma. With some it is a tempermental quality. To them religion would be constitutionally impossible without it. If one wishes to be an extreme dogmatist in his rule over himself, it is his undeniable privilege. Our concern is that he shall not enforce it as a rule of the Kingdom of Christ, thus destroying the liberties of others. A man may write as many creeds as he likes and put into them what he desires as his personal testimony, but he must not convert his personal testimony into a universal test of every other man's religion. When the life is Christlike in its purpose we cannot insist that oddities of opinion be sacrificed as the price of our fellowship.

II. *To preserve undying the voice of God in the soul of man*, instead of in any institution which we may call the church. The more directly a man can sense his connection with God, the more true and dynamic will his faith be. Christianity is not made as fully personal as it might be. With some it is little more than a devotion to a church and attendance at its services. No church can censor what God would speak to men. It is powerless to help man independent of his own agency. It becomes a "holy place" only as something personal within the worshiper makes it so. With all of the other aids to personal religion, every man in a very real sense becomes his own priest. The

church may aid him into an attitude of receptivity, but the actual worship is the voice of God in his own soul and his response to it.

Human souls are too sacred to be bungled by those ignorant of the most elemental things about them. Men are first men, then members of the church. The message should therefore be to them directly as men, for as such they must account to God. The work which they are to do is of a kind that can be prompted only from an impelling force within. This impulse cannot be borrowed extraneously. It is something wholly personal between God and the soul.

The only condition upon which faith can ever be preserved in the world is that it be personal. It then survives all contingencies, because it is identical with a surviving selfhood and drawn directly from the divine springs of supply. A robust, persistent, individual faith guarantees in perpetuity the activities which source from it. No mind can be true to God, until it is first true to itself. Virile Christianity cannot be rubber stamped. Study may bring the same type of faith which the world has accepted for centuries, but to be effective it must be reborn in the heart of him who holds it. The seeker is not after a type of faith denominated either new or old in schools of thought, but it is essential that it shall be his own and that he shall be ready to give a reason for the hope that is in him. The human spirit and the divine spirit must flow into an understanding unity which will never cloud the things between them.

The vitalization of society must be through the individuals of which it is composed. There is no way of changing humanity's aggregates except through its units. The echoed prating of some one else's theology has no power to impress the trend of events. Strong individual convictions and definite personal faiths are essentials of any Christian task. They are the structural framework upon which Christian character is built. Without them character lacks inward support and buckles under strain.

The cold gray stereotypedness of much church life may be traced to the fact that people have been taught to keep taking creed according to ecclesiastical prescription, until they get a certain predated result. Ecclesiasticism has measured out the width of the path of the soul and set the boundaries of spiritual ambition. Personal initiative and inventiveness have not been greatly encouraged, therefore they have not thrived. The effort has been to make life fit into a mold of some former conception. All the time a something stands between the soul and God.

If we doubt that dogma does restrain individual pursuit of truth sufficiently to be embarrassing, we have but to remember that under one great denominational name there are twenty-three separate bodies; another has seventeen bodies, and still another twelve, all of which have been forced by those seeking a truth which they could not follow under the constrictions imposed by the creed.

Men are led into great ideals. They are not driven. Of their own volition they respond to the

call of a worthy cause. The infallible leader is the Christ. If the soul comes directly to God for its mission none can forecast the horizons rolled back, nor the new fields of service which await him who follows the voice of God.

III. *To establish a sane basis of Kingdom co-operation.* It is a hopeful sign that almost all divisions are upon dogmatic opinions and not upon any feature of practical Christianity. Though people may differ radically on theology, they are in complete agreement on Christian conduct and good enterprises. A union which can be easily effected on a basis of Christian service is impossible when uniformity of intellectual concept is demanded. There is that universality about Christianity which makes more things held in common than otherwise. Whenever the Christian spirit is substituted for the sectarian spirit the unity of all in Christ's Kingdom has begun. It does not help to find as many differences of faith as possible; in the last analysis all good people stand on the same life-convictions and are moved by the same impulses. The barriers which divide the church will be melted away only in the heat of a great unselfish enthusiasm. They will never be argued, or explained, away. Bigness of mission will make smallness of all other differences. Heroic effort is the cure for profitless polemics. Men will be found to act and feel together more frequently than they think with uniformity. It is not too much to say that the purpose of the Church has been too individually, locally, and

denominationally interpreted to get many divisions out of the way.

We await a new Pentecost with its heavenly baptism, in which modern Parthians, Medes, and Elamites may each hear understandingly the gospel in the universal language of love and brotherhood, then the Babel of warring dogmas will be silenced. Why may not the free churches of America effect a program of unity with Christian character and service as its basis?

The wastefulness of our present system of religious administration is a severe, though just, indictment. Expenditures are being unnecessarily duplicated on every hand by denominationalism. Our present system has been unintentionally competitive, instead of helpfully co-operative, because we have been more ambitious for our denominational enterprises than for the work of the Kingdom which would not show in an annual report. Notwithstanding the charges of niggardliness against many Christian people, our gifts would more nearly finance the actual needs of the church, if we had a sane basis of kingdom co-operation. If we were to do with fewer unnecessary churches in some localities, we could have more where they are needed.

Our imperfect co-operation has forced us into unchurchly ways of supporting our churches, lowered the dignity of the church, and wasted the energies of many good people in purely incidental ways. Because there have been so many churches to support, the support has necessarily

been inadequate and the shortage has been made up by all sorts of cheap financial dodges.

The character of the work demanding attention in the twentieth century must have co-operation. The neglected mission work of almost every city is a striking example. Few individual churches are able to support the rescue, industrial, educational, and evangelistic features needed. There is nothing to identify such work with denominational interests particularly. It is Christian and humanitarian. If these enterprises were conducted jointly and all churches of the city contributed pro rata for their support, every phase of such work could have proper attention. Adequate plant and competent specialists could be provided. Every nationality could be properly ministered to.

Our social tasks are too large to be done by the divided system now in operation. It is not that a better articulated plan would accomplish more, but as now worked, the needs cannot be even touched. Our present system for all work of this character is extravagant, inefficient, and only measurably successful.

There is demand for union and federation in almost every city, village, and rural district of our country. The lack of it in church is making inroads into the unity of our American society, a thing so essential to its success. As long as it is wanting we can not digest the great foreign mass in our midst. As Dr. Gladden has pointed out: "The first Christians had to bring together in one fellowship Jews and Gentiles. But that was a

pastime compared to the herculean labor intrusted to us—the bringing together of whites and blacks, of Caucasians and Mongolians, of scores of groups divided by the barriers of language, of religion, of custom, and fusing them into one great nationality. No task of the same dimensions was ever undertaken by any people. The Church of Jesus Christ is charged with the business of furnishing the sentiments and ideas by which alone it can be accomplished.”

In the face of all this our lack of inter-church co-operation is branding much that we do with inefficiency and amateurishness. It is not the part of this brief treatise to deal with the details of such co-operation. Methods will not be difficult to find when the inner spirit of the church responds with heartiness to the outward pressure. Before the Church of Christ to-day there are but two alternatives—co-operation or failure.

IV. *To bring the Church into favor with the people as the great helper of men's lives.* Unwelcome as the statement may be, our times are witnessing a noticeable trend away from the Church. There are local exceptions perhaps and variations in the strength of the tendency. It may even be, as is frequently affirmed, that the movement is not so much away from religion, as from its organized expression, the Church. There are hosts of people who never attend church, and yet in their own hearts do not question the validity of the Christian religion. Many have broken with the restrictive dogmatism of the past and are adrift, having found nothing in its place. Others have been

trained under a narrow ecclesiastical system and have taken that as a type of all religion, and having become disgusted with that, have thrown all aside. Yet others, and unquestionably the largest number, have filled up their lives with other things, forsaking the Church because they love this present world. Whatever reasons may be assigned to extenuate the responsibility of the Church for this situation, the fact remains that it is true. Such alienation, whatever the cause, does argue at least a fault in the motive, effort, or method of the Church. If the relation between the people and the Church is ever changed, the initiative must be taken by the latter.

But, there is even a stronger feeling, especially among the toilers, whose lives are a daily pressure of unjust conditions. Many have become embittered against the Church. They have lost faith in both its ability and purpose. They feel that the Church has been consciously indifferent to them and their woes and they reciprocate the indifference with which they charge it. To them it is the institution of their oppressors; made up of, interested in, and dominated by the "favored class." The justification for their feelings will not, of course, be accepted by all; but that does not eliminate the feeling which remains a perpetual barrier to the Church, whose mission and welfare is inseparably connected with those controlled by such impressions. Yet, with all of their venomous attitude, if these same people could be convinced that the Church really meant to practice the ethics of the Sermon on the Mount, they would reverse

their attitude. They are calling for a soul at the center of everything in the Church which will identify the modern institution with the life of Him whose name it bears.

The Church will survive in the appreciation of the people, only because it ministers to their heart hungers. It cannot attract them by the glory of its past record; or because of that divine force with which many believe it to be invested. Its mission is to people. Its membership is of people. It must deal with the things of God which are vital to the people. Every institution at war with the spirit of democracy is precipitating its own doom. Because God is God, the common people must ultimately come into their own. Beyond that event they will carry the feeling that it came, either because of the Church's aid, or in spite of it, and their whole life, individual and collective, will take its character from their interpretation of the Church's attitude in their crisis.

The reason for the existence of Christianity is humanity; the force for its existence is the Christ. If you take away either fact as a working basis, Christianity is nil. It has no demand to create; it answers one already universal. The force to satisfy that demand must be as enduring as humanity and as strong as the strongest things of life. If the Church is true to the ambitions of her founder, God will preserve holy ideals within her, but she must be more than a surviving relic from the perishables of bygone days.

It is the man of the street who is shaping our theology and defining its purpose. Our seminaries

cannot longer do this. Formerly our reasoning took man for granted and started to define God. To-day we will take God for granted and seek to find man. We will believe God and love Him, but we will give the evidence of all this by our relation to man. There is no use claiming love for an unseen God without love for a seen man. The world is eager for a Christ reincarnated in the lives of his followers. It longs for a Church to be humanized as well as deified. It awaits brotherhood. The infidel movement of France gathered followers, less because of its infidelity, than because of its slogan of brotherhood. Unless my observation misleads me, the world is intently listening to a myriad of sounds in the hope of catching the true word of Christ.

The free Church is the only one in the spirit of other American institutions. It admits adjustments co-ordinating our republican form of government. Inflexible dogma and irresistible democracy can have little in common. Those who are free in all other things will not submit to domination in matters of faith. The iron rule of ecclesiasticism is of old world birth. The days will come when it must be re-born in the free spirit of America, or be retired. All phases of life in America so educate that there can be a hearty response only to the things of freedom and democracy.

But, is not the time ripe for even more? A new world's Church, with its nucleus of those who have already opened all of life to the rule of God without human intermediaries. Great issues are

evolving, which affect the life universal. The world is learning some awful lessons of the rule of autocracy. The rise of the people is due. Following them the rise of the free Church. The term "mother church," arrogantly assumed, has been void of the practice implied in the designation. Why not a free Church, under one leader, the Prince of Peace, to strike decisive issue with a self-seeking autocracy on the abolition of war? Let the men of the free churches of every nation in their own lives duplicate the severest martyrdoms of the past before they will lift arms in unholy murder. Hitherto the Church has registered her truest devotion and reaped her greatest rewards when she has taken issue with the world-life surrounding her. Is not the time ripe and the issue of sufficient magnitude?

To fully grip the people it will be necessary for the Church to fill the largest possible needs of their lives. It must not be less religious, but more varied in its activities. Let it build large enough to get the needs of a whole man inside. The Church for which the people are waiting will relate itself in some determining way to every problem of their lives. Its dominance is assured, if it speaks to that which is highest in their lives, without neglect of the rest. They will impose less severe exactions upon any other institution which touches them. That church will serve the community at large instead of the little group included in its enrollment, infusing every social movement with gospel ideals.

It is unquestionably true that very few of our social problems are purely religious. The moral and religious are interwoven with the industrial and economic. Any attempted solution which does not recognize this will fail to meet the twentieth century requirements. The Church has been going by on the other side, up to her temples to worship and has left too much of the ministering to physical needs to earth's Samaritans. What recognition Jesus gave to the needs of the physical man in His ministry! If we follow His ministrations wherever He went we are impressed with His service to the whole man. People want the Kingdom of God here as the basis for its hereafter. The redemption of our present social order is as imperative as it is desirable. In a thoroughly Christianized society those able and willing to labor should have no actual need unsupplied. The overworked and underfed, the lolling idleness of wealth and vice, are travesties upon a Christian system. If it is insisted that poverty is deserved as a penalty for vice and indolence, it only changes the direction of the Church's energies, for it is the fact itself that needs correction.

The Church cannot become the umpire of all economic disputes, or the dictator of industrial methods and relations. It can recognize the situation, and, with wise determination set itself to the task of filling all classes involved, with a spirit which obviates the necessity for umpiring and dictating in such questions.

W. DeWitt Hyde in "God's Education of Man" says: "So long as the Church exalts herself by

arrogant pretensions to be the bearer of spiritual life, distinct from the life of practical social service, it will be deserted by the strong, brainy, forceful men of affairs, and left to languish in effeminate sentimentalism, and die of clerical conceit." Christianity, working through the soul of all classes, must affect even the material conditions of their lives; make possible for the toiler a just wage, and fair living and working conditions; and assure the employer of Christian consideration.

V. *To emphasize the essentials of Christianity:* the Christ above the creed. The man reached and helped the test to be of its value. The doctrinal conceptions of the Church have ever been stressed, while the impulses, sentiments, and characters which have given to it all of the human force it has ever had, have not been made the basis of co-operation in it. The best things about Christianity cannot be put into verbal expression. Systems of opinion and programs of methods are not comparable in importance to its great life facts.

Our creedal statements have not dealt with even the essentialities of our Christianity in any large way. They are usually of doctrines not bearing on Christian life and practice, just the things which provoke the most pronounced differences of opinion. There are no matters of mere opinion worthy to stand in the way of the practical, faithful, Christian life.

The primary business of the Church is to fill men's souls with the ideals of Christ, that, regen-

erated in Him, they shall be ashamed to do otherwise than right, and will love to be brotherly, helpful, and Christlike. This spirit is the force necessary for the new social order which our times demand. The kingdom of God will not then await some set and far away millennial day. Its coming will be now, as in heaven, so on earth; because right and brotherhood prevail.

The measurement of Christianity will then be neither in mystical impression, or intellectual repression, but in its Christlike expression. Beliefs become really important only when they are applied to practice. The Church will serve humanity first, then humanity will serve the Church by serving Christ. The duty to the community will supersede work for the denomination. A Christianity of force will supplant one of form where necessary. It will be hospitable to progress. Her new watchword will be service, and a service with sacrifice in it if need be. We have too long sought to make our religion selfishly easy, apparently forgetting "if any man will come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me." How we have smugly admired our fine building equipment, our plant conveniences, our beautiful organs and music, and our elegant worship! But all of this has been for the man who comes. In this century the outside man must be the regulative factor of our program.

George E. Post once said: "The past of the Christian Church has been an age of creeds; the present is an age of deeds. In the past we were discovering what we were to believe concerning

God. In the future we are to find out what duty requires of man. The past has been an age of strife; the future must be an age of life."

These functions are not to be performed in human strength. The omnipotent arm must be in the task. No man's program, wisdom, or book will meet the necessities. There must be the divine will, the omniscient wisdom, and God's Holy Book at the foundation of it all. However appealing the call of the hour, men and Church are but tools for Stronger Hands. We shall not borrow the cry of "Backward to Christ," for we have never passed Him and His direction is never backward, but with open soul and unflinching purpose, we shall go "forward to Christ."



This book should be returned to
the Library on or before the last date
stamped below.

A fine of five cents a day is incurred
by retaining it beyond the specified
time.

Please return promptly.

C 1075.9

Modern words of religion.

Widener Library

003662932



3 2044 081 753 352